The Churchman.

VOLUME XVII. No. 26. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii.—15. WHOLE NUMBER, 858.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETORS. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 28, 1847. AT No. 12 JOHN STREET.

From the Churchman of March 1st, 1845.

The unlawfulness of a trial under a Canon enacted subsequently to the time when the offences charged against the person tried are alleged to have been committed, seems to us to be conclusively made out by Nova-Cæsaræ, on the principles of common morality and common sense as well as of law. There is another question on which men may form an intelligent opinion with no other lights than those of common sense, knowledge of human nature and love of moral equity; and that is, whether all the legislation and attempted legislation on the trial of a Bishop were not liable to be biased by the simultaneous agitation, among the members of Convention, of the question of the presentment of so marked a man as the Bishop of New York. This is one of those subjects on which it is difficult to write without either exposing one's self to the charge of insinuating what one is afraid to avow, or holding back opinions which it is due to truth and justice to express. In the way of explanation, therefore, we deem it proper to premise, that while we do not believe that the theological opponents of Bishop Onderdonk were capable of entering into a contract, verbal or written, to effect his destruction by insidious legislation, we do believe that they were not so far above the passions and infirmities of human nature, as to shut out from their minds all influence of his contemplated presentment. If we are unfair in this belief, we are unfair to human nature, and not to the opponents of Bishop Onderdonk personally considered. We hold it to be extremely improbable, on the acknowledged principles of human nature, that the prospect of Bishop Onderdonk's presentment should not have biased the legislative proceedings of all those who entertained the prospect pending those proceedings. Our remark is general, and applicable to the friends as well as the opponents of the Bishop; neither of whom, we are persuaded, could have taken part in the passage of a Canon on the Trial of a Bishop, or any kindred subject, without being influenced by considerations bearing on Bishop Onderdonk's particular case, if his trial were in prospect. Certainly there are several features in the Canon of the last Convention which, if his friends, and especially the New York Delegation, had suffered to pass in silence while they expected him to be tried under it, they would have been considered, right or wrong, to have shown a culpable remissness. But *they* had no expectation of such an event as the impeachment of Bishop Onderdonk. This we know to be true of the New York Delegation, and we have no reason to doubt that it is equally true of a large majority of those Clerical and Lay Deputies with whom they might be expected to act in concert; and it is on the ground of their not having any such prospect before them that we account for their having made no attempt to secure a two-thirds vote (instead of a majority) for a verdict, a clause of limitation, a right of challenge and other matters which might have been equitably inserted in the Canon, or at least proposed. On the other hand, it appears from Bishop Onderdonk's "Statement," from Bishop Meade's Statement, and from the pamphlets of the Rev. Messrs. Trapier and Richmond, that the opponents of Bishop Onderdonk were, during the time that the Convention was in session, engaged in measures, to which indeed the Bishop and his friends attached at the time very little importance, but which have since turned out to be preliminary to his impeachment, trial, and indefinite suspension. Is it, then, at all inconsistent with charity to believe that the opponents of the Bishop, during the Convention, entertained the expectation of his presentment? Or that, entertaining it, they acted under its influence? Or that its influence might have predisposed them to devise or favor those very features of the Canon which a counter-influence would most unquestionably have led his friends strenuously to oppose? We see nothing in the opinion inconsistent with Christian charity and sound reason; nothing which is not perfectly natural.

In the remarks, then, which we are about to offer, we mean to insinuate nothing which we are unwilling to express; but we mean to bring together facts in the order which they really occurred, and to make ourselves, and to suggest to our readers, such inferences from the combination as we think to be warranted by the known principles of human conduct.

The General Convention met on the second of October. From Bishop Onderdonk's Statement, confirmed by Bishop Meade, it appears that "some six or seven days after the opening of the Convention," Bishop Meade requested Bishop Onderdonk to leave the room in which the Bishops assembled in order, as it afterwards appeared, that the former might bring before his brethren sundry matters to the disparagement of the former. On the fourteenth day of October Bp. Chase introduced to the attention of the House of Bishops a paper relating to the character and conduct of the Bishop of N. York, and asked him if he wished to retire. Bishop Onderdonk remained, and the paper, after an earnest discussion, was not received but returned unopened to the persons who presented it. On the 12th of October, that is, between the attempt of Bishop Meade and the attempt of Bishop Chase to make the character of Bishop Onderdonk, in his absence, a topic of discussion with their brethren, Bishop McIlvaine, from the Committee on Canons, (consisting of Bishops McIlvaine, Gadsden and Elliott,) reported the following Canon—

Of the Effect of Suspension from the Ministry upon Jurisdiction.

Section 1. Any Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, who shall incur the penalty of indefinite Suspension from the exercise of the Ministry by the proper authority, shall be thereby held incapable of Jurisdiction, whether Parochial or Diocesan, during the continuance of such suspension, and shall be voided of any Jurisdiction vested in him, at the time of his suspension, by the sentence duly awarded and pronounced.

Section 2. In case of the limited Suspension of any Bishop, the Standing Committee of the Diocese of such suspended Bishop may apply to any Bishop or Bishops of this Church, to perform Episcopal duties within such Diocese; which duties shall be reported in writing to the Convention of said Diocese, at its Annual Meeting, by the Bishop or Bishops performing the same.

Section 3. In case of the limited Suspension of any Presbyter of this Church, having charge of a Parish, the Wardens and Vestry of the Parish of such suspended Presbyter may apply to any Presbyter or Presbyters of this Church to perform Parochial duties, within such Parish, which duties shall be reported in writing to the Bishop of the Diocese, in which such Parish is located, at its Annual Meeting, by the Presbyter or Presbyters, performing the same.

On motion of Bishop Ives, seconded by Bishop Doane, this Canon passed the House of Bishops. On the same day it was sent to the House of Deputies. On the 17th Dr. Upfold, Chairman of the Committee on Canons, reported and offered a resolution, to the effect that the House concur in the enactment of the Canon, striking out its first section.

The House having considered the same—on motion, *Resolved*, That this House do concur with the House of Bishops in the enactment of the Canon entitled, "Of the effect of Suspension from the Ministry upon Jurisdiction," with the following amendments—

1. Strike out the first and third sections thereof.
2. Strike out the word "limited" in the first line of the second section.

On motion,

Ordered, That the said Canon, thus amended, be sent to the House of Bishops.

The concurrence of the House of Deputies in the Canon, as thus amended, was reported on the same day to the House of Bishops.

Whereupon, on motion of Bishop Onderdonk, of New York, seconded by Bishop Brownell.

Resolved, That this House non-concur with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in their amendments to the Canon entitled, "Of the Effect of Suspension from the Ministry upon Jurisdiction."

Resolved, That notice of this non-concurrence be sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and that this House propose to said House, a conference on the subject of the above-mentioned Canon, and that the Committee of this House on the Canons be appointed on said conference.

The conference was held, and on the 18th Bishop McIlvaine made the following report—

The Committee on Canons, appointed to act as a Committee of Conference with a Committee of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies on certain amendments made by said House, in the Canon sent down from this House, entitled "Of the Effect of Suspension from the Ministry upon Jurisdiction," report that they have conferred as directed, and see no prospect that this house will be able so to modify the canon under consideration, as to free it from the objections made by the other House, without destroying its essential character.

Your Committee therefore move that they be discharged from the further consideration of this subject.

CHAS. P. McILVAINE, *Chairman.*

Whereupon, on motion of Bishop McIlvaine, secondee by Bishop Gadsden, the above motion was agreed to.

It appears then that Bishop McIlvaine reported a Canon, the effect of which would have been to make a Bishop under sentence of indefinite suspension incapable of jurisdiction; that the objections made by the House of Deputies were such as, if concurred in, would defeat this operation of the Canon; that an attempt was made in a conference to remove these objections; and that after the conference Bishop McIlvaine reported that it was found impracticable so to modify the Canon as to free it from the objections brought against it "without destroying its essential character."

But for the objections made to this Canon in the House of Deputies, Bishop Onderdonk would at this moment be incapable of jurisdiction, and stand in no other canonical relation to the Diocese of New York than to the Diocese of Ohio. Surely it is remarkable that Bishop Onderdonk should himself have moved the House of Bishops to non-concur in those very objections but for which he would not now be the Bishop of New York. Surely it is incredible that if he had had an upbraiding conscience, or the least ground for suspicion or fear of the result which a few short weeks afterwards developed, he would not have concurred in and maintained those objections of the Lower House which have saved him from total destruction. It is not in human nature that it should be otherwise. But Bishop Elliott, who was with Bishop McIlvaine on the Committee of Canons and Conference, and Bishop Meade, who, with Bishop Chase, attempted in an informal way to bring Bishop Onderdonk's alleged delinquencies before his brethren, were his presenting Bishops; and for the same reason that we believe that Bishops Onderdonk, Ives and Doane, if they had at alll expected the trial and the indefinite suspension which followed it, would have been led by such expectation to oppose the defeated Canon, we also believe that Bishops McIlvaine and Elliott, if they at all expected the trial and the indefinite suspension which followed it, were led by such expectation first to urge the adoption of the Canon and afterwards to abandon it. Thinking it probable that an indefinite suspension might soon take place, they passed a canon which made such suspension vacate jurisdiction; and finding that this end of the canon could not be gained, they abandoned it altogether.

There are some other *notanda* in this smothered canon.

1. Referring to 'indefinite,' suspension, the first clause provides that the person suspended shall be held incapable of jurisdiction, '*during the continuance of such suspension.*' Now if the framers of the canon meant by *indefinite* suspension the same as *perpetual* suspension, this clause would not have been inserted; it would either have been omitted, or so expressed as to imply that the suspended person should be incapable of jurisdiction during the remainder of his natural life. Hence we argue that this indefinite suspension was intended to be a suspension unlimited by *a prescribed* time or condition, and to continue *during the will* of some body or some person or persons supposed to have the power to remove it. In this view we are confirmed by a remark attributed to one of the Bishops in reference to the suspension (also indefinite) of Bishop H. U. Onderdonk, intimating that the sentence might be removed by the House of Bishops at the next General Convention. Now to make a sentence of suspension determinable neither by a limit of time nor the performance of a fixed condition evidencing contrition and amendment, but by the mere will, possibly the caprice, of a higher power, is an insidious encroachment of tyranny. The man or men who may keep another suspended *at will*, have him completely in their power; and though the sentence be awarded by the rules of law and liberty, yet if it may be instantly reversed or oppressively continued by the *sic volo sic jubeo* of an irresponsible power, the ends of law and liberty are defeated. Our opinion is that the Low Church Bishops, anticipating for themselves a majority in the House of Bishops, devised this Canon as a means of exercising arbitrary power; and though we regret that the design should have escaped the observation of their colleagues, we are none the less thankful that it was frustrated in the House of Deputies.

2. Why did the House of Deputies require the word *limited* to be expunged from the second section? We see no meaning in the omission, except it be that suspension is in its nature limited, and that therefore the word is superfluous. And in this view we are confirmed by the assurance of several members of the late General Convention, that the word was in fact objected to on this very ground.

3. It is remarkable that if this Canon had passed in the form in which it was approved by the House of Deputies, it would have invested the Standing Committee of this Diocese, by express letter, with the very authority which they have now felt themselves constrained to assume, and to fortify by ingenious though questionable construction. Without the remotest apprehension that New York would soon have a suspended Bishop, and with no other than a general view, the House of Deputies voted for the Canon in a form in which it would now benefit our Diocese and meet the wishes of our Standing Committee. Bishop McIlvaine, however, from the Committee on Canons, reported that *in this form* the Canon was useless. Now whether Bishops McIlvaine and Elliott did or did not entertain the opinion that our Diocese might probably soon be in the position in which it now is, it is certainly remarkable that by stifling the Canon in this form they have enabled the most violent opponents of Bishop Onderdonk to take precisely the ground which in fact they have taken in order to drive the Bishop into a resignation; the ground, namely, that the Diocese must be deprived of all Episcopal services as long as Dr. Onderdonk continues to be Bishop. The first aim of the Canon was to make indefinite suspension void jurisdiction; and being foiled in this, Bishops McIlvaine and Elliott report against the Canon in a form which, if it had been adopted, would have taken from their friends in this Diocese the strongest argument which thay now use to compass the same end, viz. to void the jurisdiction of our suspended Bishop. Bishop McIlvaine might well report that concurrence with the House of Deputies would rob the Canon of "its essential character."

We have the charity to believe that it required the excitement (in door and out door) of the late trial to work up a portion of the Court to the point of degradation; and that when the presentment was getting up, and before the public mind was pre-occupied with rumors, nothing worse was contemplated than the less odious, though equally effectual, *terminus* of an indefinite suspension which should vacate jurisdiction. Of course we do not know that even this view was held, but we will state another fact—*valeat quantum*, &c.—that a gentleman of great eminence and foresight in another diocese, wrote, pending the trial and at a time when *we* had no thought of any thing but an acquittal or at worst an admonition, to a friend in this city, pointing out the invalidity of a sentence of indefinite suspension, it being *his* opinion that the Court would terminate its proceedings with the infliction of this identical sentence.

From the Churchman of March 1st, 1845.

THE LATE EPISCOPAL COURT.

Mr. Editor,—The staleness of the charges against the Bishop of New York, has many times been referred to, as a most serious objection in point of expediency, fairness, and justice, against both the sentence and the accusation. By the general experience of mankind, a stale claim is an invalid claim, a stale charge is a futile charge, a stale rumor is a calumnious and false rumor. The exceptions only prove the rule. The fair presumption is that a party who keeps back a demand or an accusation for years, has kept it back until receipts are lost, and witnesses are dead or gone, and the means of defence have wasted away under the influence of time—that wastes away every thing but suspicion and malevolence. All nations and societies of men have acted upon this principle from the time of *Moses* to the present day. It is inexpedient to move things that have long been at rest. It is unfair to attack any one after he has been long reposing in security, and has neglected his defences as unnecessary. It is unjust to take from a man either his money or his character, by allegations which have shunned the light when it was broad day, and which come forward only when there is too little light left to see whether they are true or false. All this is obvious, has been often said, and will continue to be said, of the whole of this mischievous proceeding, by even those who cannot now say whether they believe or disbelieve the witnesses.

But there is another aspect in which the date of these charges becomes a ground of more certain reprehension. The whole proceeding under the Canon of 1844 upon charges of such date, was in plain violation of the first principles of law, moral, political and constitutional, and of the Canon under which the Presentment was made.

No respectable legislature has ever thought of prescribing punishment, and no respectable tribunal has ever before thought of inflicting punishment, for acts, which when they were committed, were not in violation of, nor punishable by, any existing law. A very eminent judge has said, that an *Act* of the Legislature, for he could not call it a *Law*, that punishes a citizen for an action which when done was in violation of no *existing* law, is contrary to the great first principles of the social compact. An *ex post facto law*, is as great an abuse, in point of morality, as it is a violation of all our political constitutions; and an *ex post facto sentence* is much worse. If an act, when it is committed, is not against the law of the land or the canons of the Church, tne law of the land or the canons of the Church subsequently enacted, cannot punish an individual for that act. If the act committed was an immorality, it must be left to the sanctions of the moral law; but if it was not a crime, that is to say an offence legally, it cannot be punished legally; and if it was not an offence according to any canon, it cannot be punished canonically. If the law purports to do it, it is a tyrannical and immoral law. If a court knowingly punishes the offence under a subsequen law, it is a lawless court. These are first principles.

All the offences for which Bishop Onderdonk was presented, except one, are alleged by the witnesses to have occurred before October, 1841; and if they ever occurred in manner and form as they are alleged, they occurred before that date. One only is charged to have been committed in 1842.

Mrs. Butler's case occurred on the 1st June, 1837. The anonymous case of Dr. Hawks, (certainly it was not the Rev. Mr. Bolles's case) occurred in August, 1838. Miss Helen M. Rudderow's case was on the 13th June, 1841. Miss Jane O. Rudderow's case occurred on the same day. Mrs. Beares's case occurred on the 17th July, 1842. The times are stated from the Record.

The first canon which the General Convention passed to make any offence of a bishop presentable (for this canon did not make it *punishable*) was the 4th canon of 1841, which was passed in October, 1841. This canon ordains that a bishop may be presented for any crime or immorality, for heresy, or for violation of the constitution or canons of the Church. It prescribes neither form of trial nor punishment, and was a dead letter.

Before this canon these offences by a bishop were not canonical offences, and were not presentable canonically: and if this canon were in force it would not comprehend any of the cases except that of Mrs. Beare. But this canon was not in force on the 7th November, 1844, when the presentment against the Bishop of New York was made. It was repealed by the General Convention in October, 1844—absolutely repealed without any saving of or for past offences, or of any kind whatever. The language of the 3d Canon of October, 1844, is in these words—"*Canon IV. of 1841 is hereby repealed.*"

The 3d canon of 1844 was the only canon on the subject of offences by bishops when the presentment of Bishop Onderdonk was made. That canon is in these words—

"The trial of a bishop shall be on a presentment in writing, specifying the offence of which he is alleged to be guilty, with reasonable certainty as to time, place and circumstance. Such presentment may be made for any crime or immorality, for heresy, for violation of the constitution of this Church, or of the Church in the diocese to which he belongs."

After this follow provisions as to the form and circumstances of the presentment and trial; and then the fifth section proceeds to say—

"And if it be that the accused is guilty, the Court shall at the same time pass sentence, and award the penalty of admonition, suspension, or deposition, as to them the offence or offences proved may seem to deserve."

To what offences does this canon apply? To such as were committed before it was passed, or to such as should be committed afterwards? Let the learned in the law—no, we want no learning on the subject—let common sense, common justice, common humanity, common morality, reply. All of them are outraged by punishing a bishop for offences, four-fifths of which were alleged to have been committed before there was a canon against them, and the remaining one-fifth was committed when there was only a canon to present and none to punish, and that canon at the time of the trial and sentence had ceased to be a law of the Church.

Let it be remarked, however, that the Canon of 1844 is not guilty of the enormity of professing to punish offences committed before it was enacted. The enormity is in the trial and sentence. The canon is not *ex post facto*, but the application of it was. Will such a judgment be permitted to stand? NOVA-CÆSARÆA.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

REVIEW OF THE TRIAL OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

NUMBER FOUR.

I come next to consider the first and second Articles in the Presentment. The second Article will deserve but a passing remark. The date of both the offences charged in these Articles is about *seven* years anterior to the Presentment, more than twice the term required of a Bishop elect to produce testimonials of irreproachable conduct, more than twice the term of the ordinary statute of limitation in the secular tribunals, in regard to crimes of the gravest character. The second specification, too, is only of a charge of being "under the influence of, and improperly excited by, vinous, or spirituous liquors." I suppose no member of the Court could have been so absurdly, themselves, *under the influence of, and so improperly excited by, prejudice*, or the *spirit* of the *times*, in this case, as to think for a moment of justifying any such sentence, as was passed upon the Bishop of New York, upon the sole ground of this second Article. Such a sentence, for such an offence, would be so glaringly absurd, to merit serious consideration. If that is the only charge, of which the Bishop of New York could be found guilty, in the long term of seven years, after so severe a scrutiny, one would think that he stood much more unimpeachable, and irreproachable, than a majority of Christian men, or even Christian Bishops. If the whole Presentment had dwindled down to that ludicrously insignificant point, it would, by common consent, have been abandoned. It is impossible to make anything serious out of a single instance of such a kind, even of the most recent occurrence, and especially when it is of so long standing as to show, most conclusively, that it was merely *accidental*. Such an occurrence no more impugns the general moral purity of any man, than if he had inadvertently taken too much food, or medicine, or had been guilty of reproving an offender with too much severity. It shows no *indulgence* in an improper *habit*, but the contrary. It does not show that the *particular lapse*, was the result of *imprudence* even, but rather the contrary, or it would, *in so long a time*, have been *repeated*. I might, therefore, with perfect propriety, leave the second Article here.

But for the sake of truth and consistency, I choose to say farther, that, judging by the best light, which the somewhat confused account given by Mrs. Butler affords, and making no deductions, on account of exaggerations and omissions, which are so liable to occur, in the lapse of so long a period, it would seem probable, that Bishop Onderdonk might have been somewhat overcome by the fatigues of the journey, and want of rest and food, and, *possibly*, might have taken a single glass of wine, intended to help to keep life in him, but which really had a stupefying effect, instead of the one intended. So that, to my own mind, the verdict of the Bishop of South Carolina, upon this point, although not proved, by any means, to my full satisfaction, seems quite as probably the fair result of the evidences then in the case, as any other which I have been able to take of this part of the charge. (See Mr. Peck's affidavit, by which this view is wholly disproved.) *

But the first Article is the only charge worthy of consideration, in regard to this matter. The second Article seems to have been *intended* merely as a make-weight in these piping times of Temperance in drink, and excess in almost every thing else, unless it be *charity for others*. Now I do not feel, in my heart, to treat Mrs. Butler with any such severity, as I think the Rudderows deserve. She no doubt acted in good faith, in regard to the Bishop, so far as a nervous, hysteric woman, just entering the new light of married life, would be expected to. No sober man would think of placing much reliance upon her construction of civilities offered her by such a kindly, fatherly old man as Bishop Onderdonk, when life was almost worn out of him; and he might still feel that he ought to do something, to relieve the toil and weariness of the fatiguing journey; but, at the same time, so weary himself, he hardly knew what to do, or how to do it, his spirit so much coveted rest; in his unsuspecting confidence, not deeming that any mortal could suspect *him* of *impurity*; a thought of which had not entered his quiet, affectionate heart, for many long years; so that, for almost half a century, his temptations had come from other quarters; struggling still, in some degree, with the flesh, doubtless, but not with lust. Mrs. Butler, too, being in a state of great exhaustion at the time, would be far more liable to misconstruction of the Bishop's acts, than in her usually quiet state.

1. It seems to me that the public, open manner in which the Bishop is here, as in all the former cases, charged with having made his rude attack upon Mrs. B. will go very far to satisfy all dispassionate men, that *he* could not have been influenced by *impure desires*, or the expectation of the gratification of any such feeling. The occasion, the presence of the husband and another man, in the same carriage, all seem to forbid any such belief, unless he expected Mrs. B. to submit to such indecent liberties, which is not probable.—If the Bishop really *did* what Mrs. B. represents, which all admit he *might* have done, without any *impure motive*, it must have been in confidence of that parental intimacy which had for many years existed between himself and that lady, and her family, and in virtue of which, she, herself, admits, she had often, before marriage, received similar caresses at his hands, without the least suspicion of his being influenced by any impure feeling. He would not at all, doubtless, comprehend that her new relations exposed him to such a tran of misconstructions. After Mrs. B's. mind began to run in this channel of suspicion against the Bishop, every motion of his, or of the carriage, would but confirm her suspicions, and to her mind, multiply instances of his *insult* and *abuse* towards her.

2. There are many things in the conduct, both of Mrs. Butler and her husband, which tend to bring somewhat in doubt, the perfect *consistency* and *impartiality* of their testimony against the Bishop. Mr. Butler made affidavit, that his wife told him the Bishop "began" to raise her clothes. Mrs. B. says she told him "The Bishop was so violent, he *might* do it." Here is certainly a very strange misunderstanding between husband and wife, upon so important a point in the case.—There are many other minor points, in regard to which Mrs. B's. testimony is not wholly consistent with itself, or with that of her husband; as for instance, the *time* she left the back seat, and the *manner*; and whether the Bishop, after that, continued to occupy that seat *alone*, until they arrived at Syracuse. Then Mrs. B's. declaring her unwillingness to speak so loud as to attract the *attention* of the *driver*, and at the same time *raising her voice*, for the express purpose of *being heard by her husband*, who sat by the side of the driver.

3. But not to dwell upon these matters, there is one consideration, which, to my mind, fully acquits the Bishop of all impure feeling in the transaction; i. e. neither Mrs. B. or her husband, who would best know, *at the time*, attributed his conduct to any such motive. And the *motive* is the *essence* of the offence. The act might be rude and offensive, but it was not *impurity*, unless *done* with that *motive*. And it is enough to excuse the Bishop from the *offences charged*.

4. But it is farther very obvious to me, that neither Mr. Butler, or Mrs. Butler's father, considered that the Bishop's conduct was surely of that reproachable character, which Mrs. Butler conceived, or they would not have suffered the matter to pass so quietly into oblivion. Mrs. Butler says her father told her she *might* be mistaken; showing, most conclusively, that *he* was not satisfied with the representation of *his own daughter*. Is it then *uncharitable*, that others should also entertain doubts of the perfect accuracy of her construction of the acts of the Bishop? Surely not. If she is only but *half* as much mistaken, in her main testimony, given upon the trial, as Mr. Butler *was in his affidavit*, or as *she* is shown to be upon some points of *detail*, the whole, even upon the most unfavorable construction, would amount to nothing, worthy of *suspicion* against the Bishop. It is obvious too, I think, that Mr. Butler himself must have come to entertain serious doubts whether most of his wife's apprehension of insult from the Bishop was not attributable to the peculiar state of her health, and the excessive fatigue under which all the party were then laboring. If this view is not entirely satisfactory to him, he evidently did attribute every departure in the Bishop, from his usual courtesy and gentleness of manner, to the *accidental* effect of a glass of wine, which he had sober sense enough *to feel* could be no good grounds upon which to bring any serious charge against the Bishop. He, of course, very prudently, let the matter die of itself. And in his affidavit he seems conscious that he was then acting an absurd part in bringing the matter forward, after "*the proper time had been allowed to pass,*" as he says. This he never would have done, unless he had been pressed into the service, to further an ulterior object, in getting rid of Bishop Onderdonk, not so much on account of his offensive morals, as his offensive views of Church doctrine and discipline. But Mr. Butler, and his wife, having thus identified their interests with the Prosecutors', must now be content to bear the *opprobrium* of their position. The result of all will be, I apprehend, to fix upon Mrs Butler, not the disgrace of having fabricated the story altogether, but of having got it up out of mere hallucinations, and "such stuff as dreams are made of." For since I made known to the friends of Bishop Onderdonk my determination of noticing the Trial in this way, there has been put into my hands, a copy of an affidavit of Mr. Peck, who is referred to, as "the driver," by Mrs. Butler, but who was, in fact, a gentleman in business in Syracuse, at the time, and who had business at Ithaca, and at the request of Mr. Butler's Vestry, consented to drive the carriage, and bring back the Bishop; and he took in Mr. B. and his wife, out of courtesy mainly. He had not "then lately become interested in the Church," as Mrs. Butler represents, but had always been so, having been *baptized into her Communion*, in infancy, and done nothing worthy of being repelled therefrom. He was, at the time of the trial, residing at Vera Cruz, and has now returned to the State of New York.

Immediately upon his return he furnished, unsolicited, the affidavit spoken of, which undoubtedly sets this whole charge in its true light.*—So that it now seems, that so far from the Bishop having been guilty of any "impurity," or rudeness, to Mrs. B. his whole conduct was truly becoming a Christian Bishop. And there is not the shadow of suspicion against the Bishop of being in the least "under the influence of, or improperly excited by, vinous or spirituous liquors." We have now disposed of all this mighty array of Low Church indignation against, and thirst for veangence upon Bishop O., except the case of Mrs. Charlotte Beare, which will merit the consideration of another paper.

July, 1847. R. F. I.

*The Affidavit here refered to was published in The Churchman of the 24th of July last.

* The whole paragraph to which this note refers was left by the wrter at the discretion of the Editor, to retain or cancel at his pleasure. The Editor has preferred to let it stand as an evidence of the candor of the reviewer.

No burden that our brother can bear is nothing to us; his burden is our burden, as our burden is the burden of our and his merciful Saviour. How much more, when it is under the weight of our common guilt that he labors! To sympathize with his repentance may be the means which God has provided to bring us to a sense of our own sin.—*Williams.*

When conscience is moved, and purposes of good are formed, it is the usual mode of God's moral providence to allow temptations of self-interest or fear to occur, in order to try the sincerity of such resolutions.—*Williams.*

For the Churchman.

Rev. and Dear Mr. Editor,—"Drowning men catch at straws," says an old proverb, and conscious imbecility eagerly seeks the aid of any coadjutor who is stronger than itself. The "Protestant Churchman" gladly flies to the open arms of the mighty "Courier and Enquirer," and joyously exclaims "hear you polemical editor, and ye pet contributors of the Churchman, what a SECULAR PRINT says," and then publishes a column or two with great marks of satisfaction.—Such an ally is not to be despised, either in politics or religion. He continually affords food for both astonishment and mirth. He is so well read in the Bible as to teach his readers that the *marginal renderings* were the works of the wicked Oxford Puseyites! and that the Church of Rome was the only Church in Christendom, till the begining of the 16th century! Is it strange then, that the people of the Protestant Churchman should faithfully obey the behests of the great leader of their party, and record his witty sayings with as much reverence, as Boswell minuted those of Johnson. Sometimes, however, this excessive devotion leads them into a scrape, and verifies the proverb, "If the blind lead the blind, shall they not both fall into the ditch?" The 'Courier' invented a story that Geneva College was to receive a large amount, as service money, for defending the cause of Trinity Church before the Legislature! This was probably meant as a piece of pleasantry; for, as Dryden says, "a tun of man in bulk, may have but a kilderkin of wit;" but the Protestant Churchman thought it a very good fling at Trinity Church, and therefore inserted it, and I think, but am not positive, accompanied it with some stupid remarks of its own. However this may be, the sequel shows the truth of the adage, that fame always gains in travelling, and the story presently appeared in the Rochester Democrat, with additions and improvements. That respectable paper, however, was soon brought up all standing, as the following extract will show, and we opine, will be very careful how it again trusts such deceptive guides as these "Arcadian brothers" of New York. The Gospel Messenger of July 2d, makes this extract from the 'Ontario Repository:'

"We regretted to see remarks in the Rochester Democrat of Wednesday, calculated to create distrust, both against Geneva College and Trinity Church, New York; but we are happily relieved of that regret by the *amende honorable* in the Thursday's paper. It now appears that the Democrat was led into its error, by some mysterious suggestions of the Courier and Enquirer, illustrated by the ungenerous, if not censurable distrust of the Protestant Churchman.

It is at least to be regretted, that the professed friends of Episcopacy should feel it to be their duty to excite suspicion, both against Trinity Church, of which we have never heard that she made a bad use of her funds, and an infant institution of learning, which every friend of education should endeavor to foster and encourage. *We fear the cause of groundless jealousies arises from an overweaning cupidity to grasp, by methods not unlike those of certain anti-renters and agrarians, property over which the agitators have no legal or constitutional control. We hope and trust that the success of such efforts, if they in fact exist, will be exactly proportioned to their merits.*"

I think, Mr. Editor, that we should thank our redoubtable opponents for giving occasion to this able defence of the parties assailed, and this thorough exposure of their unprincipled and cowardly assailants.

Such being the case, it was to be expected that a recent *characteristic* article of the Courier, in reference to the Churchman, would be gladly copied into the columns of its dutiful assistant in the anti-church cause, and that the latter would raise its feeble scream in attempted harmony with the thundering bray of the "secular print." If they think noise is argument, they are welcome to their opinion—

"Some have at first for wits, then poets passed,
Turn'd critics next, and prov'd plain fools at last.
Some neither can for wits nor critics pass;
As heavy mules are neither horse nor ass."

Pope's Essay on Critisism.

And here I might leave the last editorial of the Protestant Churchman, with the single admonition that there are only five weeks before the Convention, and that unless they write more effectually than they have yet done, they will not have answered the "masterly articles," and "demolished the flimsy fabric" of the editor of the Churchman.

As they have very confused ideas, apparently, of events at the last General Convention, it may be well to enlighten their darkened optics, and give them some themes for virtuous indignation in the next number. I propose then, to show what some of the members of the General Convention were about, while the session lasted, and how facts substantiate the assertion that the action of that body was *secretly* brought to operate in favor of a darling object—the ruin of the Bishop of New York.

First, then, as to the Canon for the *Trial of Bishops*. This Canon was reported by the Committee to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies on October 9, 1844, being the *seventh* day of the session. It was passed on the evening of October 15; the discussion on Tractarianism, and the testimonials of the Bishop elect of Mississippi, Dr. Hawks, having filled up the interval. It was then sent to the House of Bishops, and referred by them to the Committee on Canons, consisting of Bishops *McIlvaine*, Gadsden, and *Elliot*. It passed the House of Bishops on October 18, with amendments—was sent down the same day to the other House, and was passed by them the same evening. The manner in which it came before the Committee on Canons in the first instance will afford a curious instance of the Doctrine of Development, but I shall not enter into that now.

Now let us see what sundry members were about. Mr. Trapier says, p. 6, that the action of the South Carolina Convention in reference to the Seminary, in February, 1844, was brought about by the *union of those who were uneasy on the subject of Tractarianism, with those who were uneasy on the moral influence of the Right Rev. Professor*. All September was occupied with preparations for an attack on said Professor, *as such*, but the mode of attack was subsequently changed *on the passage of the Canon*; see pages 15 to 20 of his narrative. Accordingly, on the *fourth or fifth* day of the session, i. e. two or *three* days *before* the Canon was *reported*, Mr. Trapier was informed by his correspondent, a fellow member, that affidavits could be procured. Then he consulted Mr. Memminger, and on the 12th a memorial was prepared, and signed by two Clerical and three Lay members of the Convention. In the course of that day, or the next, two copies were handed to Bishop Meade, with the request that he would deliver one to the House of Bishops, and the other to Bishop Onderdonk, according to their respective directions. This paper was read on the 14th in the House of Bishops, but returned as uncanonical in the evening of that day, and Mr. T. says he received it on the understanding that affidavits were to be received by the Bishops, in

order to a Presentment, if the evidence was such as to require it. Mr. Memminger then undertook the leonine task of hunting up evidence, (aided by his jackals in the city,) the affidavits of Messrs. Butler and Beara, and the Rudderows, were obtained during the session, (nothing was said of those on the third and fourth Articles,) the Convention adjourned on the 22d; and the Presentment seems to have been ready at that time. To be sure it was not made in fact till the 9th of November, but the delay was occasioned by the unsuccessful hunt after other testimony, which in spite of the most untiring and desperate efforts, could not be obtained.

While these proceedings were going on in the lower House, the upper one was equally engaged with these rumors. Some six or seven days after the session commenced, Bishop Meade broached the subject in the House, and requested his brother of New York to retire! but was deterred from proceeding by the bold bearing, and energetic remonstrances of Bishop Onderdonk. If it was the *seventh* day, it is a strange coincidence that at that very time the Canon was brought in in the other House. Again the memorial was presented and discussed on the 14th, and the Canon was not passed till the 18th, and a Presentment was openly talked of. Is it uncharitable to suppose that the enemies of Bishop Onderdonk had full time and opportunity to ascertain the scope and bearing of the Canon? The friends of the Bishop were entirely off their guard, and had no notion of the stroke that was impending. If thus concerned in the passage of the Canon, this does not make them parties in the conspiracy, as the Protestant Churchman absurdly alleges.—How often are legislative acts framed by designing men, while those who pass them are taken by appearances merely, and fail to perceive the secret intention. When the unjust law for taxing reserved rents was proposed, it was supposed to be equitable, and passed accordingly; but it is now found that by a little jugglery nearly all the burdens of the county may be thrown upon this species of property. Had this been foreseen, the act would never have passed. Still it would be absurd to say that some of the members conspired against their own interests, because they may have suffered severely by it. Had the friends of Bishop Onderdonk foreseen the use that would be made of the Canon, they would doubtless have contended for a period of limitation, the right of challenge, a proviso against its application to past offences; and it seems strange *now* that these safeguards were not provided. We must remember however, that Church principles were then considered the chief object of attack—the attention of both Houses was mainly fixed upon the Tractarian resolutions—the precious revelations of Messrs. Trapier & Co. had not been made public, and none but the initiated knew the meaning of the mysterious nods and winks, and mystic conferences, that met the unsuspicious gaze of the casual passer by. I trust that the next General Convention will remember that they are the *legislative* council of the Church, and pay especial attention to their peculiar province, the amendment of our legal code. It may be very pleasant for the audience in the galleries to hear foolish people bring in silly resolutions about Oxford Tracts, uneasiness in the Church, and such matters, in order that they may hear plenty of *slang-whanging;* but in the mean time Canons are overlooked and hastily passed as *uninteresting*, and a cunning Machiavel may introduce his subtle scheme, and lead his colleagues, hoodwinked, into the snare. Such was the history of the Canon for the "Trial of Bishops," and the Presentment of Bishop Onderdonk.

In your last number, Mr. Editor, you have demonstrated very clearly who made the affidavit on which the third Article was founded. I hope the Protestant *Churchman* will explain satisfactorily why Mr. Bolles, who was on the spot, was not called on, and why they had recourse to hearsay testimony exclusively. Let us know, too, who gave the evidence on which the fourth Article was founded. As to the ninth, the *animus* of the Presenters, is fully explained by one of them, Bishop Meade of Virginia:

"This brings me to the last remark which seems to be called for in explanation of the conduct of the Presenters. It relates to the last Article in the Presentment, of which Bishop Onderdonk complains, and which has been the subject of much animadversion by some of his friends. It is that which states that beside the foregoing specified cases, there were sundry others, which for want of power to compel the attendance of witnesses, the Prosecutors were unable to state as particularly as the others, but that the names of the persons who could testify, and who had been summoned, were placed in the hands of the accused. In the statement made of the difficulty and failure in obtaining affidavits and promise of attendance in different cases *reported to us*, may be found our reason and our justification for this article. There were some cases which we still *hoped* might be witnessed to, when the Court should meet, but *whose particulars as to time, place, and circumstance* we had not been able to ascertain, through the unwillingness of the parties concerned.—There were others which we *hoped* the authority of the Court might enable us to attain. We designed to say to the Court, and to the accused, if it is wished to have the fullest investigation of the *whole matter*, we ask leave to *enlarge the number of cases*, and to introduce others which have contributed no little to the evil report against the accused. Lest he should complain of being taken by surprise, we had at the time of the Presentment, furnished him with the names of the additional witnesses, and if more time was required to adduce rebutting testimony, the Court would grant what was asked. Such was our motive and object in this last article of the Presentment.—The Bishop and his friends being entirely opposed to this, although *there were those of the Court who thought it would conduce to the most satisfactory examination of the case*, it was stricken out, nor did the Presenters object. They always meant to leave it to the Bishop himself."—pp. 18, 19—Statement.

Let your readers mark these points. 1. The Presenters went solely upon *reports*. 2. They had no affidavits on which to found the Article. 3. They *hoped* to get witnesses, and doubtless groaned in spirit when their *hopes* were balked.—4. Their purpose to *enlarge* the indictment from time to time, when they saw where the shoe pinched. 5. That *some* of the Court thought the Article should be retained!!! 6. The attempt to cast obliquy on Bisop Onderdonk and his friends, because they objected to such an outrageous Article. "They are stifling the plot," quoth Titus Oates.

M. N.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor.—Upon reading the leading editorial in your paper of the 17th of July, it has occurred to me to send you a few thoughts constantly suggested to my mind in the present position of ecclesiastical affairs.

Some persons regard the contentions of the day as little and unimportant. It is, beyond all question, true that the complaints of the Puritan party are trifling in the extreme. As complaints they deserve no attention whatever. Probably the leaders of that party, if requested to say what they want, could frame no demand which they would venture to make public. Yet the party making these trifling complaints is, as a party, extremely dangerous. Continual agitation, with occasional demonstrations of an attack to be made upon some important point not yet quite determined, will invariably keep in the field a force formidable in respect of numbers. It is well to consider what this force is worth, and what is to be apprehended from it, when put in motion. Here again, some will say "the truth is powerful and will prevail; this turbulence of popular feeling will soon subside and leave all things quiet."—The truth is powerful, and therefore must prevail if properly supported; otherwise, if the power of the truth is made the excuse for neglecting properly to maintain it, the truth will, so far as we are concerned, fail. The popular fury, if unchecked, will subside only when it has done enough of irreparable mischief to satisfy for the moment its savage appetite, and to scare its timid and wavering conscience. Even those who raise the storm may not be able to quell it. Mischief will be done, the more general and the more ruinous because its perpetrators have not the intelligence to make any discrimination in their work.

It needs but a few men, comparitively, to confound any mass of insurgents against the Law and the Right. But those few must be prompt, calm, and ready to make every sacrifice the instant its necessity becomes apparent; and their operations must be thoroughly combined and harmonized.—If, however, we fail, or hesitate to make the sternest resistance in the face of those whose disorderly conduct tends towards the ruin of our Church, the union of our Church is the inevitable result which must, sooner or later, grow out of this cowardice or indulgence. Uncompromising war is our duty. It will be time enough to talk of peace when a peace is conquered. There are not many men, I believe, who will not lay down their lives for their country: I trust there are some Americans who will sacrifice more than life for the Church which GOD has given them.

Yours, very respectfully, R. R. C.

For the Churchman

THE PAST AND THE PRESENT.

NUMBER FOUR.

Mr. Editor.—In turning our attention from the Clergy to the Laity, the first thing that fixes our attention in the attempt to account for the multiplied evils of "*the present,*" is the fact that so many pay absolutely nothing, and that so many of those who do pay something, come so far short of what they ought to do in support of the Service of God. If, now, God be a living Being, and not a mere "obsolete idea," this fact cannot fail to be one of the most important in accounting for the evils of the present age.

The world and this vast universe was not created for man in general, or for man individually. But for the Glory of God we are, and were created. This, therefore, must be the end of all thought, all labor, all exertion, or the order of things is disturbed and evils unnumbered and endlessly varied cannot fail to ensue.

Now, to promote the Glory of God, it is not sufficient that we merely profess to believe in Him, and to live free from the corruptions of the grosser sins of selfishness and sensuality. He has a Service to be performed by men, which is His chief glory—the Service of angels in Heaven, and of men below, to Him, their great Creator is the grand end of all things.

His glory cannot be promoted except by sustaining His Church, and the Church cannot be sustained without large and liberal contributions from the laity. It must then be a fundamental principle and duty with every man to give a portion of his income and his earnings to the cause of religion. And if he fails to do this, a curse will rest upon him and his possesions. If any one doubts that this is so, let him look through the Old Testament and see there the ways of God with man in respect to this matter.

Nor is it only true that they should give something—bring some offering when they appear before the Lord, they must come up to His requirements. This is *religion*—the Service of God—but "covetousness is idolatry."

Now when we consider how full the present age is of this species of idolatry—how many there are that give nothing, or as little as possible, and that grudgingly—is it any wonder that God sends leanness into their souls, that their wants increase faster than their wealth, and with all their possessions they are poorer than in ages past, when God was honored with the first fruits and the tenth of all our substance? There is a curse upon our wealth, or as Mr. Carlyle says, our "enchantment." No body is satisfied. Money, money is the great cry, the chief object of pursuit—and yet money does not satisfy men. They grow more stingy—more covetous—withold their contributions from the support of the Gospel—turn a deaf ear to the cry of the needy—oppress the hireling in his wages—and yet they are continually less and less satisfied. Money is lavished upon their dress—their dwellings—their equipage—their amusements—they take long and expensive journeys—visit the fashionable resorts of the gay and worldly—and though at times disgusted with the novelties of these things, they are still more and more bent upon their pursuit. The rich are striving to excel each other—the poor to imitate the rich—the rich in return to still farther outdistance the poor. Money, money is the universal cry—money to pamper their appetites—money to indulge their fancies—money to display their pride—money to serve the world, the flesh, and the devil—and they are never satisfied.

This love of gain—this haste to be rich—this ambition to make a display has eaten out, as with a most foul canker and gangreen, all the nobler and more generous sensibilities of the heart. We reduce all things to a money standard and value. We hire our minister, (as cheap as we can,) pay him his salary, (or promise it, but never pay,) and consider our obligations discharged. We compel the poor to labor for us at as cheap a rate as possible, and put money in the place of the higher and holier sentiments that should exist in such relations. It is a most miserable mistake to suppose that money can pay for the services we need from our fellow men. The finest traits and institutions of domestic and religious society, being placed on such a basis, have disappeared from among us.

Now I know no remedy for this evil but the preaching of the great doctrine that money to be lavished on ourselves is not the great end of our being; preaching it, I say, by the use of the offertory, God's own appointed means of inculcating this truth.

It may not be easy to determine how large a portion of one's earnings or income he ought to give for religious purposes. I think that no definite amount has been fixed upon in the Christian Dispensation. Many, and honored names can be arrayed in favor of the doctrine of tithes, the giving of one tenth to religious purposes. This was undoubtedly the law under the preceeding dispensation, and if the whole support of Public Worship is to come from this source, I do not well see how the required amount can be less under the present.

It is undoubtedly the will of God that so many churches be built as are necessary to accommodate all that assemble, or can be persuaded to assemble, for worship and the hearing of God's Word. It is equally certain that God would have as many ministers of the gospel supported as are necessary to perform all the divine services in these houses, and to minister to the spiritual wants of all these people.

I might enter into a calculation and show that if all men would lay on the Altar of the Lord one tenth of their income, it would be sufficient for all these purposes. Suppose we reckon the capital at six *per cent*. Each thousand dollars should pay six, ten thousand sixty, and one hundred thousand six hundred dollars a year for the support of religion. If all men would give at this rate, there is not a priest in our land but would be well sustained.

Now if this amount is necessary to sustain public worship, and to enable the Church to carry on the work that has been given her to do, it is most certainly God's will that all who will enjoy His favor should give so much. But where are the people that give in this proportion? A few of the poor may do it. But if there is one rich person that does it, I do not know who, or where he is.—Can the blessing of God rest on a people who thus rob Him? who live in splendor and luxury and let His ministers starve? who live in mansions of useless magnificence, and suffer his temples to crumble to dust, and lie in ruins? Surely, surely our pretended faith is mere make-believe, mere cant, if we ever suppose that such a people will prosper.

I am aware that this is setting the point of duty very high, but it is not the highest. Men should not live for themselves, but for God; and they will prosper best when they best serve Him and obey his will. Why else should God have required of those early Christians that they should love him better than father or mother, son or daughter, and that they should forsake houses and lands for his sake? Why else is the pious generosity of those first disciples at Jerusalem in selling *every thing* that they had, and distributing to every one as he had need, recorded with commendation, or as an indication of the reason and genuinness of their faith? If more than the tenth be required, if *all that a man has* be rendered, in order that God may be duly served, and glorified in the Services of His Church, is it not better that a man should give it and trust in the Lord for the future, than to withold, as if by trusting in his own skill, or his own might, he could provide for himself, asking no favors even at the hands of the Almighty? If His service is not the chief thing, why has the order of nature been disturbed, why has the Son of God died, why have apostles and martyrs been sent forth amid persecutions and to death; and believers, in all ages, called to stand by the faith, uphold it, profess it and defend it, at all hazards?

No, Mr. Editor, if I were a layman, I should not dare to live and bestow less than the one tenth of my income for the purposes of religion and piety, to be appropriated and used by His agents, and Ambassadors, the ministers in the Apostolical Succession, in *any* situation in life. Nor should I dare to live in the fear of this sin, in the sight of God, and the hope of eternal life, and see the house of God neglected or in ruins, the service suspended, or the minister left to starve, or driven to seek a better support elsewhere, even if it took from me the last cent of my possessions, and from my children every thing except their daily bread. I see not how else I could do, if loved the Lord with all my heart, and mind, and strength, that is better than myself.

But, says the objector, we must provide for ourselves and our families. So you must, if by industry and economy you can have anything left after you have seen that the Lord's service is provided for. Or is that old saying, "Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all other things shall be added unto you," antiquated and entirely out of force? Or was it never intended for anything more than a mere rhetorical flourish? If there be no God, or only a figment of one, then you had best provide for yourselves—get all you can, and keep all you get—make fast your gates and doors—multiply your locks and butts—make to yourself as many friends as you can, and look out for the future. But, if there be a God, and He is a Reality, and your faith be not all a sham or mere canting pretence, it is in Him that you live and move and have your being, and without Him you can do nothing; you are entangled in a net of misfortunes, whose meshes may indeed leave you a hope of success while they hold you in perpetual thraldom.

But another form of the objection is, that God works no miracles in these days—all things go on in accordance with pre-established or unvarying laws. God sends His rain alike on the just and on the unjust, and alike makes His sun to rise on the evil and on the good. But my poor brother—frail mortal—being of a moment—it will require no *miracle* to overwhelm you in ruin. Let God just leave you to yourself—to the motion of the destroying agents around you, or to the bad passions and lusts of a wicked world, and it will avail you but little that He sends you rain from Heaven, and makes His sun to rise and shine upon you. Is it not true, that "there is a God that judges in the earth?" Is it only on old superstition that "God visiteth the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Him?" Is it but a suggestion of sloth and prodigality that "the righteous are never forsaken, nor His seed seen begging their bread?" No, it requires no *miracle*, as we use the word, to overwhelm you with misfortunes—to reduce you from affluence to the most wretched destitution, and make you (more than all) an object of hatred and disgust among your fellow men. It requires *no miracle* to surround you with blessings—to turn the hearts of all men towards you with the most helpful favor. God has not put the affairs of His universe so far out of His hands, into the keeping of certain "general laws of nature," that man may sin against Him with impunity, trample His laws under their feet and set His authority at defiance. Here we are beneath the glance of His unslumbering eye—within the grasp of His omnipotent hand. What are we that we can withstand God? It is beyond all contradiction certain (if we admit the Bible to be true) that He requires to be considered the first object of our affections and our duty—that we must postpone or sacrifice every thing else to the performance of the duty that He has required—that He has promised us that he will furnish us all that we shall truly need if we will thus serve Him, and has threatened to overwhelm us with evils of one kind or another, if we disobey Him or neglect His service.

Is it not best, then, that any man should give, at the least, one tenth of his income and his earnings unto the Lord? Is it not best, if need be, that he should give *all* that he has rather than that due service of God should be suspended? What better investment can one make of his property than to "lend to the Lord?" Who will more abundantly and more certainly repay than He? What greater worth can a man have for time and for eternity than the favor and loving kindness of the Lord? Surely this can never be gained while we bestow more upon our own lusts than upon His service.

The feeling that men have, that they cannot afford to pay much for religion, springs out of a root of unbelief. They do not believe or consider life, death, and all their blessings come from God, and therefore they neglect His Worship, and trample His laws under foot.

Doubtless there are limitations to one's responsibilities in this matter. My first duty is undoubtedly at home, or in my own neighborhood. I am first of all to see that God's service is performed and supported adequately, and that the poor here, in the parish where He has placed me are competently provided for. For this ordinarily I suppose that one tenth of my income will be justly due from me to the Lord. If after I have done this I hear of others who are destitute and needy, either in a temporal or spiritual point of view, charity doubtless requires that I should do something to relieve them.

Under other circumstances it may require all I have—even to the last penny—and more than all to sustain the service of God and to relieve the poor in my immediate neighborhood. But I know of no better use to which I can put whatever the Lord may have given me. Is not this implied if its creed should so require in the devotion of ourselves, to Him which we make and he demands? What am I here for? What is the chief end of man? to get wealth? to provide for himself or his family? Surely not; but to serve God and to glorify Him forever. It may take all we have. It may leave us poor—though God has promised to provide for our real wants, if we do His Will. But suppose it takes all we have, is it a thing impossible that He should require of us poverty as the fiery trial through which we are to pass? Has He required His servants in ages past to yield their limbs to the cross and the rack, or their bodies to the flames? does He now require His ministers to endure starvation? and may He not require of you poverty, conjoined with labor and the bestowment of your earnings for His service, as the means through which you are to pass to His eternal kingdom.

But inquires one, "how shall I know whether God requires this of me?" Easily, my good brother. If the poor in your parish are unfed and unclothed—if the Church you attend is out of repair—if the minister whom Christ has placed over you is not comfortably supported and enabled to give his whole strength and time to his holy work, or if one man is not competent for the whole, so that two or more are needed, and these things are not otherwise provided, then here is the direct call of God that you should provide for them, if the means you have will go so far. It may be more than your proportion. Doubtless it is. But I suspect that you will not object to receiving more than your "*proportion*" (if that is to be the word) of the heavenly felicities and glories. And this may be—nay, it *is*—the very means that God is giving you to secure that incomprehensible supereminency hereafter. "He that soweth plenteously shall reap plenteously." "He that soweth little shall reap but little."

But alas! alas! We in the present age not only do not render unto God His due, but we continue to give the little we bestow to somebody else. Instead of bringing it to Him to be offered on the Altar and appropriated by His appointed and authorized stewards, we get up subscriptions and "pay the sums set against our names respectively" to—not the Lord—but the collector. Thus we give as a personal favor to "the deserving objects" of charity. Thus we hire a minister and pay *him* the wages or salary for his services. We do not give to the Lord, that he may care for the poor, or support His servants while they do His work.

Thus in every way do we contrive to forget God and keep Him out of our thoughts—to lose sight of all obligations to Him. We complain of the evils we suffer, but do not consider that they are sent upon us by an overruling Providence as a punishment for our sins. CONTRIBUTOR.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—I was right glad to see recently, in an extract from the Christian Witness, the following just sentiment: "Whatever the Episcopal Church may do, or may leave undone, it is quite out of the question to please the sects about us." This language is the more gratifying because it comes from the same diocese and city in which, in a recent controversy between its Bishop and one of the best of his Presbyters, the former seemed to be evidently influenced by a solicitude for the good opinion of his Socinian and other dissenting neighbors. The Witness is right. There are undoubtedly among "the sects" a great many excellent and Christian minded people, in whose society Churchmen may find much pleasure and profit, and whose kind and favorable regards we may both enjoy and desire. As a body, however, and in its manifold subdivisions into distinct bodies, the spirit of sectarianism is essentially antagonistic to that of the Church. The former is anti-Christian, and except so far as it is kept in check by the catholicism, or truly evangelical Church spirit, around it, has an inevitable tendency to the corruption, and ultimate supplanting, of the Gospel. The papacy of Romanism, and the anti-episcopacy of Protestantism, have both proved to be breaches of Christian unity, leading to farther and still farther departures from Christ the Head. In Protestant sects, the spirit of Puritanism, like its prototype Popish Jesuitism, has had a most deleterious influence on the faith, piety, and morals of Christendom. It infuses a spiritual pride very adverse to a just consideration of those who differ. It subjects to the lawlessness of private judgment all reverence for the ancient Catholic and evangelical views of truth and duty. It fosters arts and methods of accomplishing ends often attended with blindness to what is fair and honorable. What it has in common with the Gospel sits loosely upon it; so loosely, that feelings of real union and harmony with those who are truer to the Gospel, are very apt to be reduced to what is to be merely talked of, and, when supposed policy dictates, made a subject of boastful or canting profession, rather than incorporated into real character, or honest desire. The discordant materials, too, of which the dissenting "Christian world" is formed, keep its parts in perpetual irritation. From the anger and strife maintained among themselves, it is something of a relief to find in the Church an object against which they may enjoy, for lack of unity of love, a unity in warfare. The restlessness of the opposition of the sect-spirit, and the keen relish with which it fastens on any thing deemed faulty in the Church, seem to exemplify just that state of mind which results from a consciousness of being wrong, and itself justly exposed to censure—a sort of phrase of that species of uneasiness to which reference is made in the fearful expostulation, "A wounded spirit who can bear!" The periodical press maintained, in their severalty, by the petty districts of the great empire of schism, is the embodied life of this sect-spirit, in its diffusion and its concentration. We look in vain to that for any thing like settled kindly feeling towards the Church. "It is quite out of the question to please the sects about us." It would be contrary to the nature of things to look to them—except for some purposes of policy—for any other feeling than hostility—the opposing of our peculiarities; the magnifying of our failings; the taking that part, in our unfortunate contests, which goes most against our true principles and best friends; and the turning of those contests, as far as possible, to our greatest disadvantage. The true friends of the Gospel in the Church may rest well assured that the interests of that holy cause are best promoted by total indifference to what the sects think of us. They govern their thoughts by a view to their own interests. To the High Church they are opposed out and out. Of the concessions of others, they make use just as far as it suits their ends, and then revile them as, at best, weak and inconsistent men, who, in heart, dissent from their Church, but from considerations of policy, maintain union with it.

These reflections, Mr. Editor, were suggested by the above mentioned extract from the Christian Witness. While I was pondering them, I saw an extract from the "New York Observer," a paper belonging to some of "the sects about us," in which the editor is meddling with the concerns of the diocese of New York, just in the style that we would expect to see adopted by one actuated by truculent passions, and an impure imagination, in fastening on subjects most grateful to its taste. Besides this indulgence, too, there is that other one, always craving and always welcome, of injuring the Church.

You, Mr. Editor, are engaged in grave and important discussions touching great principles of law and justice. You are striving for ends essentially connected with human rights, and with the prevalence, in the legislation and discipline of the Church, of that true equity which our holy religion enforces. You are contending against principles and precedents revolting to all the just feelings of freemen and of Protestants. You are laying before the public, views of legislation and government which commend themselves to the earnest attention of civilians and citizens, as well as ecclesiastics and Churchmen. In doing this, you are compelled to refer to statements which you would gladly conceal; but which Bishop Onderdonk's enemies have obtruded upon the public in all their disgusting detail, and mixed up with the egregious faults of ecclesiastical administration which you, in the name of truth, justice, good order, and religion, are opposing by strong and able argument. Your arguments are unmet, save by vituperation in a style evidently welcome to cherished tastes, and encouraged by a predominant desire to injure the Church. But go on. The fearless and disinterested advocate of right never in the end suffered for it. His is the only course consistent with true Christian faith. The timid and the wavering, the time-servers and policy-seekers, as they have thus fallen short in Christian consistency, so are they rarely left, by even whatever measure of temporary success and favor they may have gained, with easy consciences, or an uninjured character. There is a good sense, a love of justice, a Christian principle and feeling in the community, which seldom fail to see the right at last. These are already beginning to discriminate between your course and that of your opponents—between argument, and *conscious inability to meet argument.* P. A.

For the Churchman.

OF WHAT SORT THEY ARE.

Mr. Editor.—The Episcopal Recorder has a voluminous and apparently favorite correspondent, "P." who is a most hearty out and out radical, revolutionizing, Low Churchman. He goes for having the Prayer Book altered to suit his party, and if that cannot be done, dividing our Church. He is, moreover, abundantly pugnacious. He wishes to bring down the strong arm of power upon the High Church. Like another Diotrephes, he would cast out all who will not receive his "other gospel." He and Ira Warren, the furious Massachusetts pet, are genuine developments of Puritanism in the Church. When men prefer other ways to the Gospel, it is no wonder that they take up arms against the Church, though they be the rebelious arms of children whom she has nourished and brought up.

"P."—certainly an impartial judge—speaks thus of a Low Church editor—of course a "*pious*" man. Is he a fair sample of the genus? I give the original capitals and italics: "The writer well remembers the unutterable disgust with which, years ago, he threw down a letter he had just received and read. It was from an editor of one of our religious periodicals, and such was its strain:—'those nuisances,' alluding to certain anti-evangelical Bishops, 'those nuisances Providence will in time remove from His Church;' and yet, in his weekly columns, this same man was continually 'nosling about the knees of power.' In *private*, 'THOSE NUISANCES!' in *public*, 'OUR RIGHT REVEREND PRELATES!' and so on, through every form of interested adulation. O the mischiefs such editors inflict upon our Bishops!—the terrible mischiefs they bring upon the Church!" D. E.

THE CHURCHMAN.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 28, 1847.

FLOYD SMITH, General Agent, No. 12 John-st up stairs

We come now to the Seventh Article of the Presentment, which is as follows—

And the said Bishops presenting do further present and allege, that on or about Sunday, the seventeenth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-two, the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk, then being Bishop as aforesaid, held a confirmation at Zion Church, Long Island, in the Diocese of New York; that after the services were ended the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk returned to the house of the Reverend Henry M. Beare, where he was a guest, in the carriage of the said Henry M. Beare, in company with Mrs. Charlotte Beare, the wife of the said Henry; that the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk and Charlotte Beare occupied the back seat of the carriage, and the other persons in the same were so situated as to have their backs towards the Bishop and the said Charlotte; that thereupon the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk impurely and unchastely put his arm around the body of the said Charlotte Beare, drew her towards himself, and at the same time felt her bosom in an improper and indecent manner, so as to scandalize the feelings of the said lady, and cause her to remove herself from him as far as the side of the carriage would permit, to avoid his rudeness; in violation of his duty as Bishop, and his consecration vow in that behalf, and to the disgrace of his said office.

The charge, it will be remembered, is Immorality and Impurity, and the acts here specified to sustain the charge are that the Respondent 1. "put his arm around the body of the said Charlotte Beare," 2. "drew her towards himself," and at the same time, 3. "felt her bosom in an improper and indecent manner."

The first inquiry is, Does the specification sustain the charge? In other words, are the acts alleged proofs of Immorality and Impurity? If so, then the seventh article was proper for trial; but if not, then it should have been stricken from the Presentment. On this question we shall not dwell, but shall leave it to the consideration of the reader, in connection with the following remarks of our correspondent "Libra," in the Churchman of Aug. 14—

It is plain then, from the Canon of 1832 and from this Rubric, that the Church does not profess to administer the *entire* moral law; this Rubric and Canon are her calm legislation; and they prove that she claims to administer no more of that law than is essential to the good order of her people and her affairs. She involves not herself in Montanism or other perfection*ism*, or any *ultra* pretensions. And in this she is right. For, the Almighty, though He gave His full law, every "jot and tittle," to be *obeyed*, hath not committed its broad *enforcement* to human pastors and governors. To discharge such a function, men must be more than men. The Church is ordered to promulge, to explain, to inculcate every commandment of God, without exception or reservation; but she is not empowered to compel judicially their observance in all their scope and comprehensiveness. Conscience, for each individual, is the wider magistrate, in this world; and so is sound and well-settled public opinion. And the judgment-day will make the divine sovereignty complete, before the universe, and for eternity.

That the General Convention has gone beyond this due limit, in bringing before an ecclesiastical judicatory "ANY *immorality*," i. e. ANY violation of God's complete moral law, on the part of a class of persons within its jurisdiction, is deeply humiliating to our Church, and to all her members, who are too "meek and lowly in heart" to "stretch themselves beyond their measure," and who would not that she should "sit as God in the temple of God."

"These two paragraphs," observes a private correspondent, referring to the above quotation, "contain a *principle*, a principle of the deepest importance, acted on from the foundation of human society, though not adequately delineated. That God hath not given His *whole* moral law to the administration and execution of men, even for earthly ends, may safely be regarded as a *postulate:* that is the sound and strong view. But if any object, they may be referred to the imperfection of mortal judges, to almost uniform legislative modesty, to the instinctive abhorrence of Lynch law, which often is more righteous than the statute, and to some of the remedial effects of the day of judgment."

These are words of wisdom, and cannot fail to arrest the attention of thinking men. Waiving, however, further reference to this point, and supposing, not granting, that the above specification is adequate to the charge, we proceed to the inquiry, whether the charge involved in this specification is sustained by the testimony. Mrs. Beare, on her direct examination, testified as follows—

14. In what part of the day was the first ride; and from what place, and to what place?

After the morning service; from church to our home.

15. What was the distance from the church to your home?

About a mile.

16. Who rode in the carriage with you besides the Bishop; and how were the parties seated?

My husband's mother and his nephew, who were sitting on the front seat; the Bishop and myself on the back seat.

17. On which side of the Bishop did you sit?

At his right hand.

18. Will you please state what occurred between you and the Bishop during that ride?

The Bishop put his arm around me in an unbecoming manner, which caused me to draw from him. There is nothing more to state of that ride.

19. On what part of your body did the Bishop put his hand when he put his arm around you as you have stated?

His hand pressed upon my bosom.

20. When did you first communicate the knowledge of this transaction to any person, and to whom?

To my husband soon after we returned home; he walked home.

21. What was said by you to your husband when you first communicated the fact to him; and what was his reply?

I told him in this way; that I did not wish to ride with the Bishop in the afternoon, as I thought him too familiar in his manners. He asked me in what way. I told him the occurrence of the morning, and he expressed great surprise. He said, "If you can avoid it, do not let it alter your manner towards him while he is in our house." That was all.

The Counsel then proceeds to examine this witness with respect to the matters alleged in the eighth article; and after reading carefully the examination of all the witnesses of the Prosecution in connection with Mrs. Beare's case, viz. Mr. and Mrs. Beare, Drs. Milnor, Wainwright, and Muhlenberg, we cannot find a word more bearing on the charge involved in this seventh article of the Presentment. The article, therefore, is sustained by the above quoted testimony of Mrs. Beare, or it is not sustained at all.

Now what does Mrs. Beare testify? "The Bishop," she says, "put his arm around me in an unbecoming manner, which caused me to draw from him." This is the sum total of her spontaneous testimony; and the prompting of the Counsel for the Prosecution draws from her, not so much a new fact, as a more particular explanation of the one above stated. "On what part of the body," he asks, "did the Bishop put his hand when he put his arm around you as you have stated?" The answer is, "His hand pressed upon my bosom." She testifies also that on her return home she told her husband what had happened, and expressed a wish not to ride with the Bishop in the afternoon, as she thought him too familiar in his manners; and having added that her husband, on hearing the occurrence, begged her not to let it alter her manner towards the Bishop, she concludes her testimony by saying, "That was all." Here ends the testimony of the Prosecution in behalf of the seventh article of the Presentment.

Mrs. Beare thought the Bishop too familiar in his manners, and Mrs. Beare had the same right which every virtuous woman has, to prescribe for herself and for all who approach her, her own standard of propriety; and the standard which every virtuous woman prescribes she can make respected and observed. Whether a woman's standard of correct deportment be unaffected and unartificial, tempering freedom with dignity and vivacity with discretion; whether it be stiff and repulsive, or whether it be prudish and fantastical, is her own concern and hers alone; and whatever it be she has the power to compel its observance, as well as the right to prescribe it. Be the limits of the freedom which she allows what they may, whether they be such as to repel what is "*too* familiar," or to repel familiarity in every degree and of all sorts, we are bold to say that no man can (without her consent) transcend them with impunity. Mrs. Beare's account, above quoted, sustains us in this remark. The Bishop put his arm around her in what she deemed an unbecoming manner, and she instantly repelled the freedom by drawing from him; and the result was, to use her own words, "There is nothing more to state of that ride." The repulse of the freedom was its sufficient reproof, and the freedom was not continued, nor repeated.—Whether Mrs. Beare were right or wrong in her opinion, natural or fastidious in her manners, is no person's business but her own; her will was her law, and her law, like that of every virtuous woman who is true to herself, was obeyed. "There is nothing more to state of *that* ride."

Now we suppose it may be safely assumed that on the facts, as given in evidence, the three Bishops who made inquisition into the morality and purity of the Diocese, would not have ventured to erect a separate article of Presentment. Had they sought to obtain the best testimony they could in order to a presentment; in other words, had they seen Mrs. Beare and procured her testimony directly from herself, one of two things would have resulted; either Mrs. Beare, on conference with them, would have sworn to more than she swore to on the Trial, or the Presentment, as respects this article, would not have been made. In either case the Presenters would have been free from the blame which now attaches to them of having made a specification which is manifestly not supported by the testimony. In the latter case, moreover, that is to say, in case the Presenters, having seen Mrs. Beare and ascertained directly from her the facts in the case, had determined (as in equity they must have determined) not to make the seventh article of the Presentment, it is obvious that the eighth article would have been tried under circumstances much fairer and more favorable to the Respondent than when preceded by the seventh.

But instead of seeking out the witness on whom they could rely for the proof of the specification, the Presenters took the affidavit of a person who was not a witness of the occurrence, whose account of it was second-hand, and therefore no *proof* whatever of its truth. They took the affidavit of Mr. Beare and founded the seventh article of the Presentment on the following statement, which we quote from the affidavit—

The Bishop and my wife occupied the back seat, my mother and nephew were on the front seat, with their backs to the Bishop; my nephew was driving. I walked home, (about a mile,) and as soon as I reached home, my wife, in some agitation, took me to her room, and then informed me that she thought the Bishop was too familiar, and had taken liberties with her which she did not like; that on her ride home from church the Bishop had put his arm around her, and drawn her close to him, while with his hand he had felt her bosom; that she had quietly removed his hand, and endeavored to draw herself away from him as far as the seat would allow, in which she succeeded. I, at that time, had heard nothing of similar acts of misconduct on the part of the Bishop, and therefore told my wife that perhaps she had misunderstood his motives; but she persisted in her belief, that his motives were impure.

Here we have a different account of the matter from that which Mrs. Beare has given on the Trial. The difference, it is true, is not so much in the facts, though there *is* a difference even in the facts, as in the coloring, exaggeration and construction of the facts; but still it is striking and not to be overlooked. "*Soon after* we returned home," says Mrs. Beare, as if the matter were one which she might communicate at her leisure; "*as soon as* I reached home," says Mr. Beare, as if the matter were too important to be concealed for an instant. I communicated the transaction, says Mrs. Beare, as if it had occasioned her no pain or excitement: "in some agitation," says Mr. Beare, "she took me to her room," as if the matter had caused feelings of shame and mortification which she could only impart in private. "The Bishop put his arm around me," says Mrs. Beare, "in an unbecoming manner, which caused me to draw from him;" he "had put his arm around her," says Mr. Beare, "*and drawn her close to him* * * and she "*endeavored to draw herself away from him as far as the seat would allow, in which she succeeded.*" Of the Bishop's *drawing her close to him*, of her *endeavoring to draw herself away from him as far as the seat would allow*, and of her *succeeding* in the endeavor,—all acts implying rude importunity on the one hand, and a prolonged effort of successful resistance on the other, Mrs. Beare says not a word; or rather she denies them, for having given her own brief and simple statement of the matter, she adds, "There is nothing more to state of that ride." "I thought him too familiar in his manners," says the wife; "she thought the Bishop was too familiar and had taken liberties with her which she did not like," says the husband. When he put his arm around me, says Mrs. Beare, "his hand pressed upon my bosom;" as if the latter had been but a momentary and accidental consequence of the former; "had put his arm around her and drawn her close to him," says Mr. Beare, "*while with his hand he had felt her bosom*," which last, in connection with "liberties," and *drawing her close to him*, and the *endeavor* to escape which was crowned with *success*, as well as the phraseology "*while he felt*," forbids the supposition of the lady's being subjected to a momen-

tary and accidental annoyance, and creates the belief of a premeditated and prolonged sensual contact. Finally, Mr. Beare swears that his wife not only believed, but "persisted in her belief that his [the Bishop's] motives were impure;" a point which Mrs. Beare not only fails to sustain, but by strong implication denies; for having stated that she thought the Bishop "*too familiar*," and quoted a remark of her husband which puts out of question the supposition of impurity, she immediately adds, "*That* was all."

This seventh article, then, must be classed with the third as one which the Presenters' own witness has failed to sustain. But besides the general injury inseparable from all such unfounded charges, the seventh article has been peculiarly injurious to the Respondent, by prejudicing the minds of the Court and the public in regard to the eighth article, which is the gravamen of the whole Presentment. All the other articles, indeed not excepting the ninth, which was not tried, and which the Presenters knew could not be tried, have had this effect; but the seventh is in an especial manner introductory to the eighth, and renders impossible a fair and independent judgment respecting it. For when the Court and the public were once prepossessed with the belief that the Respondent had insulted Mrs. Beare in the morning, on the Lord's day, immediately after a confirmation, one of the most solemn services of the Church, they were of course prepared to believe in a more aggravated repetition of the insult in the evening. The eighth article, therefore, which is the main stay of the Presentment, was, if not prejudged, at least adjudicated under such previous bias as to throw suspicion on the verdict of the Court respecting it.

It is true that the majority of the Court, though they rendered a verdict of *Not Guilty* on the third article, found the Respondent *Guilty* on the seventh article; but the testimony is so manifestly inadequate, that we venture to say that the majority of the Court themselves, on a revision of the case, would, on this point, reverse their decision. For where is the *proof* that the Respondent put his arm "*impurely* and *unchastely*" around Mrs. Beare? Where is the proof that he "*felt* her bosom in an *improper and indecent manner*?" Where is the proof that he *scandalized* the feelings of the lady on this occasion? Where is the proof of immorality and impurity in an act which this witness herself, at the trial, merely characterized as "unbecoming" and "too familiar?" Where is the proof that the Respondent caused Mrs. Beare "to remove herself from him as far as the side of the carriage would permit, to avoid his rudeness?" Where is the proof that he, on this occasion, "violated his duty as Bishop and his consecration vow?" All these things are laid in the Presentment in conformity with Mrs. Beare's affidavit, but of all these things *there is not one word in the testimony* given on the Trial. The Court, however, was unquestionably bound to render a verdict on each article conformable to the testimony adduced in its support; and it is therefore with unmeasured astonishment that we read (p. 258 of the Trial) the following distinct and separate adjudication of the Court in regard to this most important specification—

The seventh specification having been read:

The Bishops of Illinois, Connecticut, Vermont, Kentucky, Ohio, Louisiana, and Delaware; the Assistant Bishop of Virginia; and the Bishops of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and the South Western Missionary Diocese, respectively declared the opinion that the Respondent was *Guilty* of the said specification.

The Bishops of North Carolina, New Jersey, the North Western Missionary Diocese, Western New York, South Carolina, and Maryland, respectively declared the opinion that the Respondent is *Not Guilty*.

We do not believe that any person, however partial to the Presenters and hostile to Bishop Onderdonk, will venture to defend the verdict of the majority on the above specification. We cannot imagine any grounds on which its defence can be plausibly rested. We cannot find in the written opinions of the majority a solitary reason which gives even a color of justice to their conclusion. The charge, as laid in the Presentment, is ruinous; the facts in support of it; as given in evidence, are thoroughly insignificant; and yet the distinct verdict of *Guilty* on the whole charge as involved in this specification, stands out in bold relief on the Record; resting, as is too palpable to be denied, on the mere *ipse dixit* of the Court!

And why should it not rest there, since for the generality the decision of the Court is sufficient? In vain do we remind men that the Court itself, as if distrustful of its decision, has appealed to the Church; the answer is, The Court has spoken! In vain have the minority rested their decision on grounds which carry conviction to minds open to conviction; the answer is, The majority—a mere numercial majority, without the check of a Court of appeal or revision, acting on the crudest principles, and in contravention of settled rules—have decided the matter! In vain do we put the testimony and the verdict side by side so that all eyes may see the manifest disproportion between them; the answer is the same, We believe as the Court believes! Most beautiful illustration of *Protestant* freedom! When did Puritanism ever fail to show itself the ape of Popery? When did its deluded followers ever fail, in their mad freaks of stubborn self-will and sullen hate, to reproduce some stale and stupid mimicry of principles which in Rome are always manifested with the redeeming features of symmetry and grandeur? Romanists tell us that, be the iniquities or fallacies in the *process* of a Council what they may, the HOLY GHOST determines the *result*, but Romanists restrain the doctrine to *Universal* Councils in matters of *faith*; while our modern jackdaws, pluming themselves in the peacock's feathers, vaunt, forsooth, in the same tone of a *local* assemblage of less than a score of Bishops, in a matter of *discipline!* "Is he a Churchman?" quoth the Poet, "then he's fond of power." This is well enough for rhyme; reverse the order and it will be written for reason: Is he fond of power? THEN he is a Churchman; a "Bishop Hobart" Churchman, an Oxford Churchman; a Romish Churchman; aye, higher than all, a Bishop Chase and Bishop M'Ilvaine Churchman.

We say confidently that the verdict of the Court on this seventh specification *proves* either a carelessness on the part of the majority, or *a predetermination to convict*, at all hazards, *the Bishop of New York*, whose downfall was tantamount to the ascendancy of Puritanism and its lawless rule. This is a necessary inference, from the *fact* that the verdict is totally devoid of a shadow of proof from the testimony. "I begin," says Bishop Brownell, "with the seventh and eighth articles of the Presentment. The facts charged in these articles are the most recent in point of time, and *they are so nearly related that they may well be considered together*." This, if we may be allowed to say so, is not treating a question of life or death to a Christian Bishop, of joy or anguish to a thousand anxious bosoms, of peace or distraction, innocence or guilt to the Church of GOD, with all *the care* which it deserves. The articles were separate in the Presentment, and the members of the Court, all and singular, were required to render, and did render, a separate verdict on each of them; and if the Respondent were *innocent*, as from the testimony he most certainly was, of the seventh specification, justice was outraged and mercy was forgotten in the process which pronounced him *guilty*. "The facts here charged," proceeds Bishop Brownell, "are sustained by the positive and clear testimony of Mrs. Beare, and supported circumstantially by her husband." Mrs. Beare, as we have seen, says not one word of the pretended facts in the seventh specification, which rest solely on the affidavit of Mr. Beare, as given to the Presenters at the instigation of the Rev. James C. Richmond. "I consider their truth," adds the Bishop, "to have been virtually admitted by the Respondent, at the interview with the Rev. Mr. Beare, and the Rev. Drs. Milnor, Muhlenberg and Higbee;" the pretended facts in the seventh specification were not once mentioned at this interview; "and I regard the testimony of the three first named gentlemen as evidence of this virtual admission." Not one of these gentleman has ever pretended that the Respondent admitted any one of the facts alleged in the seventh specification. "I am therefore compelled to say," concludes Bishop Brownell, "that the facts charged in these articles are proved, and the Respondent is guilty." *Compelled*, indeed, to find a brother Bishop guilty of Immorality and Impurity in a specification of which he had not before him a tittle of proof! Surely Bishop Brownell did not treat the subject, in this particular, with all the *care* which its immense importance demanded. But if Bishop Brownell, venerable for his years and wisdom, with a heart which kindness and benevolence have made their home, and the head of a Diocese whose escutcheon had never before been stained, could thus find his brother guilty of one specification *because* (we can find no other reason) he believed him guilty of another, is it to be wondered at that the generality of men once convinced, with reason or without, that Bishop Onderdonk was guilty of the *eighth* specification, should dart to the conclusion that he is guilty of all the specifications, (not excepting the ninth, which would cover his life with infamy,) because "they are so nearly related that they may *well* be considered together." *Well*, indeed, for indolent and reckless men, well for the enemies of religion; but not well for the man whose life and character were involved, not well for God and His Church.

Bishop Brownell has revealed the process by which he arrived at the verdict of Guilty on this seventh specification, and we say no more of it than that it evinces want of care. But what shall we say of the other Bishops who have touched on this point in their written opinions? Bishop Lee, having remarked that the ninth article was stricken out and the fourth not tried, proceeds to say—

There remain the specifications in Articles I., II., III., V., VI., VII., and VIII., upon which proof has been offered, and upon which each member of the Court is to pronounce whether, in his opinion, the accused be *guilty*, or *not guilty*.

Upon these specifications, I pronounce as follows: viz., upon

Article I.—Guilty.
" II.—Guilty.
" III.—Not guilty.
" V.—Guilty.
" VII.—Guilty.
" VIII.—Guilty.

Thus Bishop Lee approaches the subject with all the care, caution and collectedness which its importance demands. Let us hear then his opinion on the seventh specification. Speaking of the testimony in support of Articles 1st, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th, he says; "This evidence is, itself, so positive and distinct, and comes from those who must be cognizant, certainly, of the truth or untruth of the facts charged, that it is impossible to avoid one of these conclusions; either, on the one hand, that those facts are sustained; or, on the other, that the witnesses have deliberately perjured themselves on this solemn occasion. There seems to be no door of escape from one or other of these deductions." Strong words, we confess; but of what weight when the truth is that no one witness swore to a single fact as charged in the seventh specification? Again, referring to the argument for two witnesses, Bishop Lee remarks: "That it does not apply to the charges contained in Articles 1st, 7th, and 8th;" and again "In the case of Mrs. Beare, contained in Articles 7th and 8th, there is before the Court, the distinct admission of the facts charged, by the Respondent himself, testified to by three credible witnesses." Now whatever admission may be pretended to in regard to the eighth article, there most certainly has not been a syllable of admission testified to by any witness in regard to the facts alleged in the seventh article.

But Bishops Polk, Henshaw, and Freeman, in their joint opinion, go farther; they not only affirm that the matter "alleged in specifications first, seventh, and eighth, were proved, either by the testimony of two witnesses, as in one case, or, as in the two others, by the clear and direct testimony of one unimpeached witness, and corroborated by the acknowledgment of the Respondent himself, to other witnesses," but they assign this as one among other reasons for their verdict of Guilty on the fifth and sixth specifications; "inasmuch as immoralities of the same kind" are alleged in all. Thus they make the 7th and 8th articles not one case but two cases, and taking the seventh as a separate case, they declare, without a shadow of proof in evidence, that *it* is supported by the direct testimony of one witness and corroborated by the acknowledgment of the Respondent himself to other witnesses, and then assign their belief of this seventh article as a reason for believing the fifth and sixth articles. Does any man wonder that the Bishop of New York was condemned? With such reasoning as this, and on such premises, could the angel Gabriel have obtained an acquittal?

Certainly this distinct consideration of the seventh specification evinces no want of care respecting it, but still we wish not to be forced in regard to the above named Bishops on the other alternative which, if the specifications were separately weighed, we cannot avoid and which yet we tremble to admit, even to ourselves. We will then believe, despite of appearances to the contrary, that there was some oversight, or unintentional neglect on the part of the above named Bishops in regard to the seventh specification. Was it so with all the other Bishops who rendered on this specification a distinct and separate verdict of Guilty? They have not (with the exception of Bishop Hopkins, who has not touched on this point,) explained to the Church the grounds of their decision, but still we hope that in their case also the verdict on this Article was among the *blots*

quas aut incuria fudit
Aut humana parum cavit natura.

But if so, will they not have the magnanimity to acknowledge it, and to acquit the Respondent on at least one article on which they have most unquestionably found him guilty without proof? The acquittal, indeed, would come too late to prove, what at the proper time it would have gone far to prove, their candor and impartiality during the trial; but not too late to be hailed as the dawn of a new day of peace and charity, justice and truth.

We make no apology for the freedom with which we have spoken, because we are not conscious of having transcended the limits which the majority of the Court have conceded; *they*, and not the Respondent, in this case, have appealed to the Church at large; and have thus voluntarily subjected *themselves* to the law of Zaleucus,* by staking their reputation on the result:

* Polybius (Hist. Lib. 12, § 7, (του δε νεανισκου κ. τ. λ.) tells us that by one of the laws of Zaleucus, a party dissatisfied with a judge's determination might appeal to the supreme council of five hundred, before whom the judge and the appellant appeared with halters around their necks, and that whichever of the two was found to have given a wrong interpretation to tne law was strangled on the spot.

The challenge given some time ago by the Rev. James C. Richmond, to the Doctors of old Harvard, to discuss with him, orally, in the English tongue, after the manner of the Universities, the three great doctrines—Episcopacy, the Trinity, and the Atonement, has not as yet been accepted. Nothing daunted by their dignified silence, Mr. R. went to Cambridge this week to seek access to *the works of the Catholic Fathers, in the original, which may be supposed to be in the library of Harvard*, and to renew his challenge.

Should this attempt to engage the Doctors fail, Mr. R. will take a room in Boston, and give himself to a mission for which few, if any, are so peculiarly qualified. He will lecture on the important subjects which he wished to discuss, gather a congregation, and build a church, in the service of which he is resolved to spend and be spent.

The "Midsummer's Day Dream;" of which he is the author, to which we called attention a short time back, a remarkable production, and startling for these times, worthy to be bought and read universally, is out with the imprint, SECOND THOUSAND. We shall find room in our next for a fuller notice of it, and an extract from it.

It is on sale, we learn, at Stanford & Sword's in this city.

The Protestant Churchman has at length entered on the argument; and devotes the editorial columns of last week to the first of the FACTS to which we referred as a "sufficient *a priori* argument for attaching no weight to the verdict of the Court;" the fact, namely, that the trial was *ex post facto*.

The Protestant Churchman affirms that the Churchman "manifestly employs the phrase in its *literal* sense, and thinks he has achieved his work, when he pronounces that the Canon by which the Bishop was tried was passed '*after the act was done*.'" He then quotes Justice Story and Chancellor Kent (see both quotations in the margin*) to the effect that an *ex post facto* law is not merely (as the words literally mean) a law passed *after the act was done*, but is a law which either 1. makes an act which was done before the passing of the law, and which was innocent when done, criminal; or, 2. aggravates a crime and thus makes it greater than it was when committed; or, 3. changes the punishment and inflicts a greater punishment than the law annexed to the crime when committed; or 4. alters the legal rules of evidence, and receives less or different testimony than the law required at the time of the commission of the offence, in order to convict the offender. Having laid down these marks, one or more of which must be found in every law which is strictly and technically *ex post facto*, the Protestant Churchman proceeds—

Did the Canon of 1844—

1. Make any acts committed by the Bishop, *criminal*, which were *innocent* when done? Answer.—No. The Canon is entirely silent on this point.

2. Did the Canon *aggravate* in enormity or punishment the acts done by the Bishop? Answer.—No.

3. Did the Canon prescribe any different rules of evidence from those prevailing when the offences were committed? Answer.—No.

Then, of course, it does not come within the rule laid down as to *ex post facto* legislation.

To all which we answer, that in speaking of Bishop Onderdonk's trial we have not used the term *ex post facto* in its literal sense merely, but we have intended to affirm, and do affirm, that the Canon under which Bishop Onderdonk was tried is *ex post facto* in the strict or technical as well as the literal sense of the phrase. On this point Justice Story and Chancellor Kent are sufficient authority for us, and we proceed, therefore, to test the Canon under which Bishop Onderdonk was tried, by the marks which they have laid down, the presence of any one of which makes the Canon strictly and technically *ex post facto*.

We adduce the third of the above enumerated marks, and ask first; Did the Canon of 1844 change the punishment and inflict a greater punishment than the law annexed to the crime when committed? We answer, Yes; for the Canon of 1841 *annexed no punishment* whatever to the offences for the trial of which it provided, while the Canon of 1844 annexed the penalties of *admonition, suspension*, or *deposition*. The Protestant Churchman, indeed, asserts the contrary, but as he has published the Canons, he has put it in the power of the more intelligent readers of his paper to correct his mistake.

Here we might leave the matter, for this one characteristic of the Canon of 1844 makes it in the legal as well as literal sense *ex post facto*. But we go further and add that the Canon of 1844 has "made an act that was done before the passing of the law, and which was innocent when done, criminal." Of course we take the Canon as interpreted by the action of the Court, and (passing other acts) adduce in proof "the being under the influence of and improperly excited by vinous or spirituous liquors." No previous canon ever recognized such an offence, but the Canon of 1844 (as interpreted by the Court) has not only forbidden it under the word "immorality," but has made it in the strictest sense "criminal" by the prohibition of it with a penalty annexed.

This whole subject was exhausted, and every possible objection which can be made to the view which we have taken of it was anticipated and rebutted by a correspondent of our journal, shortly after the Trial, under the signature of Nova Cesaræa. The gentleman then editing the Prot. Churchman raised against this writer the same objections as the above, and almost in the same words, and soon found to his cost that he had fallen into a lion's grasp. Before we saw the last Protestant Churchman, we had made arrangements for the republication of all the articles of Nova-Cesaræa. On our first page this week will be found his first number; and if the writer in the Protestant Churchman will have the patience to wait till next week, his memory will be refreshed with some things which he has forgotten. The three numbers of Nova-Cesaræa, which will follow that of next week, are a digest of the history and principles of our ecclesiastical code, and of their bearing on the present case, which all who are interested in the question would do well to study; the writer being one at whose feet abler men than the editors of the Churchman or the Protestant Churchman would feel honored to sit as learners.

* Justice Story says;—"Of the same class are *ex post facto* laws, that is to say, (*in a literal sense*,) laws passed after the act done. The terms *ex post facto* laws, in a comprehensive sense, embrace all retrospective laws, or laws governing or controlling past transactions, whether they are of a civil or a criminal nature. * * * * The general interpretation has been, and is, that the phrase applies to acts of a criminal nature only; and that the prohibition reaches every law whereby an act is declared a crime, and made punishable as such, *when it was not a crime when done*; or whereby the act, if a crime, is *aggravated* in *enormity* or *punishment*; or whereby *different* or *less evidence* is required to convict an offender than was required *when the act was committed*. The SUPREME COURT have given the following definition: "An *ex post facto* law is one which renders an act *punishable* in a manner in which it was *not* punishable, when it was committed." Such a law may inflict penalties upon the person, or may inflict pecuniary penalties, which swell the public treasury. Laws. however, which *mitigate* the *character* or *punishment* of a crime already committed, may not fall within the prohibition for they are in favor of the citizen."—(Fletcher in Book 6, Cranches Rep. p. 138. Story's Com., v. 3, p. 212.) Another distinguished jurist, Chancellor Kent, remarks of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Calder v. Ball, (3 Dallas, 386,) that it was therein "held that the words *ex post facto* laws were technical expressions, and meant every law that made an act done before the passing of the law, and which *was innocent when done*, criminal; or which aggravated a crime, and made it *greater* than it was *when committed*; or which *changed* the *punishment*, and inflicted a *greater punishment* than the law annexed to the crime *when committed*; or which *altered* the *legal rules of* evidence, and received *less* or different *testimony* than the law required *at the time of the commission of the offence*, in order to convict the offender."

For the Churchman.

The following hitherto, as is believed, unpublished lines from a great poet, have been in the Rev. James C. Richmond's possession more than five years, and are now printed in his Midsummer's Day-Dream, Libellus; or a little Book of the Vision of Shawmut, which has for its motto—

Seria cum possim, quod delectantia malim
Scribere, tu causa es lector;

which Mr. R. has done into English—

When serious bards some lighter method use,
Blame thyself, reader, and absolve the Muse.

The *First Libell* ends with a Vision of the Library at Cambridge, which (as Mr. R. has challenged the University, according to ancient and orthodox custom, in reference to great Christian doctrines,) will have some interest just now.

Here are the famous lines—

Amid Hesperian gardens on whose banks
Bedewed with nectar and celestial drops
Eternal roses grow, and hyacinths
And fruits of golden rind; on whose fair hue
The scaly-harnessed dragon ever keeps
His unenchanted eye, and round the verge
And sacred limits of the blissful isle;
The jealous Ocean, that old river winds
His far extended arms, till with steep fall
Half his vast flow the wide Atlantic fills,
And half the slow, unfathomed Stygian pool.

DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCE.

RHODE ISLAND.—St. Paul's parish, Wickford, R. I., is one of the oldest Episcopal parishes in New England. The church edifice in which they now worship, formerly stood in North Kingstown; nearly fifty years ago, it was removed to its present site. This parish has long needed a more comfortable place of worship, and we are highly gratified to learn, that a commodious church is to be soon erected for their use.—*Christian Witness*.

PENNSYLVANIA.—A recent visit of Bishop Potter to the churches in Susquehanna county, is thus described by a correspondent of The Banner of the Cross:

"Very large congregations filled our church, and a good number for this section were confirmed.

Four in St. Mark's Church, New Milford;
Six in St. Paul's Church, Montrose, and
Eight in St. Andrew's Church, Springville.

This, I say, is a good number, and God be praised for the same. The Church here is evidently strengthening: the people are awakening to their privileges and responsibilities. You know I resigned part of the charge I had last year, in order to devote more time to two Parishes. But herein I am agreeably disappointed. An interesting point is now opening at the Great Bend in this county. The Bishop preached there. Last Sunday I visited there and preached; the attendance was very large, and decidedly of great interest.

I found at my last visit a good number of persons devoted to the Church, and could they enjoy stated service, a good congregation could, I doubt not, be collected. A number of young men, acting as engineers on the railroad, are anxious for regular service, but the greatest difficulty will be to obtain a room. I think with a little assistance they would build a plain house for present use. I am indeed very much encouraged in my labors; they are still arduous and increasing; and I have no prospect of having them lessened. But I faint not; while flesh holds out, my heart will hold on.

The Missionary's horse continues well, and does good service."

NORTH CAROLINA.—A correspondent (M.) of The Banner of the Cross furnishes that paper the following interesting account of Bishop Ives's visitation. The prospects of the school at Valle Crucis are, as we learn from other sources, more than ever before encouraging. The corps of instructors there is soon to be largely increased.

Mr. Editor,—It has been my privilege to accompany our revered Bishop upon the Summer Visitation of the Western part of his extensive Diocese: and supposing that it will interest many of your readers, it is my purpose to give a brief account of his services up to this time.

On the 2d Sunday after Trinity, the Bishop consecrated to the service of God, the Church of the Epiphany at Leaksville, in Rockingham county. The Rev. J. R. Lee, minister of the church, read the sentence of consecration, and the morning prayer. The Bishop preached, administered confirmation, and the holy communion.

On the 3d Sunday after Trinity, the Bishop said prayers, and preached in the Court House at Wilkesboro, Wilkes county, in the morning; and in the afternoon said prayers and administered the holy communion to a sick person and others in private.

The next two weeks were spent at Valle Crucis where the Daily Service is read. On the two Sundays the Bishop officiated, assisted by the Rev. H. H. Prout, Missionary in the county, and resident at the Mission.

On the 6th Sunday after Trinity the Bishop consecrated Grace Church at Morgantown. This is a neat edifice of wood, built in the form of a Cross, one transept of which is used as a vestry-room, and the other devoted to the accommodation of colored persons. The arrangements of the chancel are such as to indicate the sacramental character of our holy religion. The sentence of consecration was read by the Rev. Joseph C. Huske, Missionary at the station, and the Morning Prayers were said by the Rev. H. H. Prout, assisted in the lessons by the Rev. Mr Haske. The Bishop administered confirmation and holy communion.

On Wednesday, July 14th, the Bishop was prevented by severe illness from officiating at Ashville according to appointment. Since Easter last he has been suffering from intermittent attacks of Neuralgia, which are at times so violent as to make his strong frame quiver like an aspen. How deep the devotion to the duties of his sacred office, and to the Church of Christ, that causes him, against the advice and entreaties of those who love him as a holy father, to sacrifice every comfort, and to risk his very life, that the Body of Christ sustain no injury. Alas! if God should see fit to chastise us by removing to the Paradise of rest one of whom we are not worthy.

On the 7th Sunday after Trinity, at St. John's in the Wilderness, the Rev. Mr. Pinkney of South Carolina, said prayers, and the Bishop preached, confirmed five colored persons, and administered the holy communion. Evening Prayer was said by the Rev. Mr. Pinckney, and the Bishop preached.

On Wednesday, July 21st, in the Court House at Rutherfordton, the Bishop said the Morning Prayers, baptized one adult, confirmed two persons, preached, and administered the holy communion. In the afternoon the Bishop read service and preached. The congregation here are expecting to erect a Church edifice.

At Lincolnton, on Saturday July 24th, the Rev. J. C. Huske said morning prayers, the Bishop pronouncing the Absolution, and bestowing the Apostolic benediction.

The 9th Sunday after Trinity was a memorable day for Valle Crucis. At 6 o'clock A. M., Morning Prayer was said by the Rev. J. H. Parker, immediately after service the members of the Institution preceded to witness the batipsm of one of the pupils in the waters of the Valley. It was a beautiful scene. Opposite on the bank stood the calm, green trees, the pure waters beneath murmured their holy undersong and an immortal soul there in the presence of GOD and of Christian men was reconciled to Him, and made a partaker of the Divine Nature of Christ. Through the fertile valley encircled by green hills flow three streams of crystal water in such a way as to form the head and arms of a cross. Where these meet, becoming "three in one" was he baptised into the death of Christ. May the life of Christ dwell in his body and soul, bring both to a joyful resurrection. At 11 o'clock A. M., in the Chapel of the Institution, the Bishop admitted two persons to the holy order of Deacons. A great concourse of the mountaineers was present to witness this the first ordination ever held in their midst. Notwithstanding their great number the strictest order was observed, and very marked attention paid as well to the various services, as to the Bishop's forcible exposition of the necessity and benefits of the Apostolic Ministry. In the afternoon of the same day a colored person was baptized, and the holy rite of Confirmation administered to eight persons. At the Offertory in the morning more than ten dollars was collected.

It seems evident that if this Institution, founded in the faith and love of GOD, be sustained, as it ought to be, by the prayers and almsdeeds of Catholic Churchmen, there will in due time spring up in these mountains, a harvest meet for the Angels, who as reapers, shall come at the end of the world. Brethren in Christ! let us faint not, lest their loss be ours.

Valle Crucis, Aug. 5th.

ILLINOIS.—Confirmations by the Bishop, two persons in the chapel of Kickapoo village, July 11th.

Ordination by the Bishop, July 18th, the Rev. Abm. J. Warner to Priest's Orders, and Henry Safford to Deacon's Orders.

July 25th, in Tremont, the Bishop consecrated a new church edifice.—*Church Times.*

No stronger illustration could be given of the growth of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this Territory, attributable, under Providence, to the zealous and untiring efforts and high character of her clergy, than the fact that at the *first* Annual Convention, which was held in this city a few weeks since, there were more clergymen in attendance and more parishes represented than at the *eleventh* Annual Convention in Illinois.—*Milwaukie (W. T.,) Sentinel and Gazette.*

Notices.

SERVICES FOR THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.

Having been requested by the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New York, under the authority given them by the Diocesan Convention, to perform Episcopal Services in that Diocese, where they may be needed in Churches which have not been recently visited, I hereby give notice that I shall, God willing, visit the following named places in Putnam, Dutchess, and Ulster counties, at the times specified below, and that I shall be ready to perform such Episcopal services as may be desired of me.

Sunday,	September	19th, at Cold Spring,	10 1-2, A. M.
"	"	" at Phillipstown,	3 P. M.
Tuesday,	"	21st, at Fishkill Landing,	10 A. M.
"	"	" at Fishkill,	3 P. M.
Wednesday,	"	22d, at Wappenger's Creek,	10 A. M.
"	"	" at Poughkeepsie, St. Paul's,	3 P. M.
Thursday,	"	23d, at Pleasant Valley,	10 A. M.
"	"	" at Lithgow,	3 P. M.
Friday,	"	24th, at Red Hook,	10 A. M.
"	"	" at Saugerties,	3 P. M.
Sunday,	"	26th, at Brooklyn, Holy Trinity,	10 1-2 A. M.

W. H. DELANCEY,
Bishop of the Diocese of Western New York.
Geneva, August 17, 1847.

To Correspondents.

"Mastix," "Amicus Ecclesiæ," "N. J.," and "Curiosity," are received.

DIOCESE OF VERMONT.

The Annual Convention of this Diocese will meet in St. Paul's Church, Burlington, on Wednesday, the 15th day of September, at 9 o'clock, A. M.

A. K. PUTNAM,
Secretary of the Convention.

Bellows Falls, Vt., August 18, 1847.

The Annual Meeting of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York, will be held in the Sunday school of St. John's Chapel, New York, on Tuesday, 28th September, at 5 o'clock, P. M.

J. W. DILLER, Secretary.

August 21st, 1847.

The *Free Church of the Holy Evangelists*, in Vanderwater-street, having been closed for the last four weeks, for the purpose of cleaning, will re-open on Sunday the 22d inst. Divine service, as usual, at half past 10 A. M. and half past 3 P. M. August 21.

EMIGRANT STRANGER FREE CHURCH
OF
ST. GEORGE THE MARTYR,
No. 429 (*corner of Howard*) Broadway.

This Church is designed to be a *Free Church* for the more immediate use and benefit of BRITISH EMIGRANTS. Landing in this country, as strangers, they are often drawn entirely away from the fold of the Church of which they were members and attendants in their native land. They are not aware that the *American Church*, whose real principles and character they often hear misrepresented, is identically the same in Liturgy, Doctrine, Rites and Worship, with the United Church of England and Ireland, from whose bosom they have come: and, for want of this knowledge and proper spiritual guidance, they are sometimes led off from the care of the Church into strange pastures, and sometimes, even into the haunts of infidelity and vice.

The Services of this Church being those of the *Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, are intended to be available to all persons who desire to have the ministrations of God's Holy Word and blessed Sacraments. The seats are entirely free, open to the use of all who are willing to occupy hem. Such families, therefore, whether English or American, as reside within the immediate vicinity, and are not in the habit of worshipping regularly elsewhere, are hereby most earnestly and affectionately invited to attend this church.

Divine Service is performed every Lord's day, in the morning at half-past Ten o'clock, in the afternoon at half-past Three, and in the evening at half-past Seven. The Holy Communion is administered on the first Sunday in the month, and on all Festival-Sundays throughout the year.

The Sunday School commences at 9 o'clock in the morning, and parents are solicited to send their children.

MOSES MARCUS, Rector,
Missionary to British Emigrants, and Chaplain
of the "St. George's Society of New York."

New York, May 22, 1847.

☞ St. Barnabas's Church, (seats free,) in 27th stree between 2d and 3d Avenues, is open for Divine Worship every Sunday at 10 1-2 A. M., and 4 P. M., and for Sunday School at 2 P. M.

All who are friendly to the support of *Free Churches*, are respectfully invited to attend.

Donations for this church are earnestly solicited. It is the *only* church in a wide range of population where the seats are all free. Brethren, we feel the importance of sustaining this enterprise, and we feel our weakness too. We want aid. Our hands must be held up, or the only church for the *poor*, whom Christ said "we have always with us," must be closed, and they left to wander as sheep having no shepherd. Brethren, will you let us cry unto you in vain?

We are very much in want of a communion set, and a small organ, the donors of which would receive the blessing of this infant parish.

☞ Contributions for this church may be left with Floyd Smith, Esq., at the office of the Churchman, or at the residence of the Rector, Rev. Hiram Jelliff, corner of 31st street and 1st Avenue.

New York Institution for the Blind.—The next session will commence on Wednesday, September 1st, when it is expected that all the pupils will have returned to resume their places in the classes.

Those intending to become pupils would do well to enter the Institution at that time. The expenses of board and tuition exclusive of clothing are $130 a year. Blind persons between the ages of 8 and 25, whose friends may be unable to support them at the Institution, may be appointed state pupils by forwarding to the Superintendent of Common Schools at Albany, a certificate signed by the overseers of the poor, stating the fact of permanent blindness, the age and moral character of the pupil, and the pecuniary inability of friends.

☞ Editors in the country will confer a favor upon the blind by publishing the above.

WASHINGTON AND OTHER POEMS. By Cynthia Bullock, a graduate of the New York Institution for the Blind. For sale at this office. Price 50 cts.

New York, May 15, 1847—tf

Emmanuel Free Church—Corner of Prince and Thompson streets.—This Church is open for Divine service on Sundays at the following hours—10 1-2 A.M., and 4 P. M.,

The third service to be discontinued until further notice.

New York, July 10th, 1847.

ST. SIMON'S FREE GERMAN CHURCH.
Houston street, between Pitt and Ridge streets.
Rev. THOMAS COOK, Minister.

Divine service is regularly held in the above church every Sunday morning at half-past 10, and half-past 7 i the evening.

Friends of the church acquainted with the German language are affectionately and earnestly invited to attend.

The Sunday school, which is composed exclusively of German children, commences at 9 A. M., and 2 P. M. The instruction is imparted in the English language. Teachers are very much needed.

June 5, 1847.

Acknowledgments.

Domestic Missions.—Since his acknowledgment of the 17h August, the Treasurer has received the following contributions:

From St Thomas's ch, Brandon, Vt, 3 50; Christ ch, Westport, Ct, 6 75; Trinity ch, Edgefield, S C, 10; St Paul's, Wallingford, Ct, 4 64; from a friend to Missions; Brooklyn, monthly offerings, 1; a Sunday school class, St Matthew's, Jersey City, for education of Indian children, 87 cts; monthly missionary collection, Christ ch, Norwich, Ct, half, 25; St John's, Yonkers, N Y, 40 60; St Mark's, Lewistown, Pa, 15; Christ ch, Alexandria, Va, part collection, 16; from a lady, a friend to missions, 20; for the Jews, 1. Total, 143 36.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
New York, August 24, 1847. 139 Broadway.

New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums,

From St Paul's ch, Glen Cove, Rev Alfred Jenks, 3; Mrs Henry Laight, annual subscription, 5; donation, 20. Total amount, $28.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.

New York, August 24, 1847.

Protestant Episcopal Tract Society.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:—

From St Paul's ch, Wallingford, Ct, Rev H Bryant, 2 76; St Paul's ch, Glen Cove, L I, Rev Alfred Jenks, 4; Mrs Henry Laight, annual subscription, 1. Total amount, $7 76.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street

New York, August 24, 1847.

Married,

At Fort Washington, July 29th, by Rev. David Ingalls, Mr. GEORGE W. CLARKE, and Miss MARY J., eldest daughter of THOMAS MCKIE, Esq., of this city.

Calendar.

AUGUST.

29. Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

SEPTEMBER.

5. Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.
12 Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.
15. Ember Day.
17. Ember Day.
18. Ember Day.
19. Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity.
21. St. Matthew the Apostle.
26. Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity.
29. St. Michael and All Angels.

Advertisements.

THEOLOGY.—LIST NO. 3

Zimmerman on the Knowledge of Christ. 1 50.
Wogan Essays on the Proper Lessons. 4. vols., also in 2 vols.
Pyle's Sermons on Practical Subjects. 2 vols. 2 50.
Neander's General History. 2 vols.
Nelsons on the Holy Communion. 18mo.
Kennaway's Sermons to the Young. 1 50.
Hammond on the New Testament. 4 vols. 8 00.
do do. Folio.
Hare's, Bishop, Whole Works. 2 vols.
Hare's Perservative Against the Errors of Socinianism. 2 00.
Waldo's Commentary on the Liturgy. 1 75.
Toplady's Whole Works. 6 vols. 10 50.
Riddock's Sermons. 2 vols. 3 00.
Hoadley's Whole Works. 3 vols. folio. 10 50.
Burnett's History of his own Times. 2 vols folio. 6 50.
Albadie on the Divinity. 18mo. London. $1.
Abercrombie's Lectures on Church Catechism. 8vo. 75 cts.
Abernethy's Sermons. 4 vols, 8vo.
Adams's Exposition of the Four Gospels. 2 vols. 8vo. 5 00.
Do. Do. of St. Matthew. 8vo. 1 50.
Do. on St. Peter. Imp. 8vo. 6 50.
Do. on Romans. 7 50.
Do. Religious World Displayed. 3 vols. 4 00.
Do. Private Thought. 31 cts.
Do. A System of Divinity, &c. &c. 1 00.
Addington's Life of the Apostle St. Paul. calf, 8vo. 1 50.
Addison's Evidences, with additional Discourses. 1 25.
Alexander on Conons of Scripture.
Do. Evidences.
Do. Isaiah.
Allens—A Chain of Scripture Chronology from the Creation to the Death of Christ. 4to. 1 50.
Allestry Sermons, folio, 4 00.
Alliene Works. 1 00.
Allison's, Sermons (various editions.)
Ambrose Looking unto Jesus, &c. 2 00.
Ambrosii Epesiojii. 1 75.
American Church, by Wilberforce. 1 50.
Anderson on Lord's Prayer.

For sale by
STANFORD & SWORDS, 139 Broadway.
A new Catalogue of Theological Stock to be had gratis.
August 21

THE RETREAT.

A BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES,

Under the supervision of the Bishop of Pennsylvania,

On School-house Lane, five miles from Philadelphia, near the crossing of the Philadelphia and Norristown Rail-road.

Miss M. A. SPAFARD, Principal, Mrs. E. SPAFARD, Assistant Principal, M. FELIX DROUIN, late Professor of the University of France, Teacher of French and Latin, Mr. J. A. GETZE, Teacher of Music.

Letters for "Retreat" to be addressed Box 858, Post-office, Philadelphia.

Refer to the Rt. Rev. Bishop Potter, Rev. D. H. Macurdy, 128 North 12th st., Dr. C. Treichel, Custom-house, Robt. Ralston, Esq., No. 4 South Front st., Philad., and James C. Kempton, Esq., Manayunk.

August 28—eaw

CHURCH OR TOWN CLOCKS.

RANSOM SMITH, 7 1-2 Bowery, New York, manufactures a beautiful and substantial article of Steeple Clock—with jewelled (agate) Escapement, steel Pinions and Retaining Power—warranted, when well put up, not to vary half a minute in a month, which he will sell as cheap as the same quality of clock can be purchased in the world. Also an elegant and superior circular Time-piece, for the inside of churches, banks, offices, stores, &c. &c.

He will also furnish church bells as cheap and as good as can be obtained elsewhere.

Individuals and committees are invited to call and see.

August 28—6m$

TO TEACHERS.

WANTED, in a private school, in a healthy and pleasant situation in Maryland, a single gentleman of experience in teaching, who is a communicant of the Church, and can bring satisfactory testimonials of his character and standing, and of his being well qualified to teach the Latin, Greek, and French languages, Mathematics, and the different branches of English. For further particulars address the Rev. John R. Keech, (P. P.) near Belle Air, Harford county, Md.

August 28—2t$

CLASSICAL SCHOOL, BROOKLYN HEIGHTS.
No. 30 Clinton street.
By the Rev. B. G. NOBLE.

THE next Term of this school will commence on Monday, the 6th of September. Assistants—C. H. FORCE, A. B., New York University, in the ancient classics and English literature. ROBERT HOLDEN, A. B., Columbia College, in Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and the Greek Language. Rev. F. B. Wilkenman, D. D., in the German Language. M. De la Place, A. B., in the French Language. G. F. Lekeli de Cassali in the Italian and Spanish Languages.

References—Rev. Dr. Cutler, Rev. E. M. Johnson, Rev. Dr. Stone, Rev. Dr. Lewis, Rev. F. Vinton, Rev. F. A. Farley, Rev. H. F. Pease, Rev. Dr. Spencer, Rev. Dr. Henry, Rev. J. L. Hodges, Rev. S. R. Johnson, D. D., E. J. Bartow, Esq., Dr. C. F. J. Goodrich.

Brooklyn, Aug. 28.

A LADY who has had eight years experience in the charge of a school, and who is a member of the Episcopal Church, would like a situation as Governess in a family, or Teacher in a school. She is perfectly familiar with all the English branches, and Drawing, and has a daughter qualified to teach the French language, and Music. The best of references can be given. No objection to going into the country. Apply at Clinton street, second door from Amity street, South Brooklyn.

August 28.

THE COLLEGE OF ST. JAMES,
Near Hagerstown, Maryland.

THE next Session of this Institution will open on Monday, October 4th—at which time the students in College and in

THE GRAMMAR SCHOOL

should punctually attend. All the usual classes in the Collegiate and the Preparatory Departments are fully organized. Application for further information, or for the admission of Students, to be made to

JOHN B. KERFOOT, Rector.

P. S. A Boarding-house for the accommodation of parents and others visiting the College will be opened on October 1st, immediately adjoining the College grounds.

August 14—8t

ST. PAUL'S COLLEGE.

ST. PAUL'S COLLEGE AND GRAMMAR SCHOOL at College Point, Long Island, will re-open on Monday, October 4th. All applications for the admission of students to be addressed to J. G. Barton, Rector of the College. August 28.

EDUCATION.

REV. R. T. HUDDART'S Classical School will be re-opened after the summer vacation on Monday, September 6th.

Two young lads from the age of 14 to 18 will be received as Private Pupils and Boarders. Terms may be known on application, either personally or by letter, at his residence, 22 East 14th street, between University Place and Fifth Avenue.

August 21—is4t.

THE COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, 95 Mercer street, will be re-opened on Monday, the 30th August.

The 27th Annual Circular containing terms for Boarding and Day Scholars, can be obtained at the bookstores of Mr. R. Carter, corner of Mercer and Canal streets, and at Leavett and Trows, corner of Dey and Broadway.

FORREST & McELLIGOTT,
Principals.

August 28—6t

ORGANS FOR SALE—St. Mark's Church Organ. Inquire of the Sexton, Mr. Disbrow.

Also, three Gothic Organs, just finished.

Two Grecian cased Organs.

A second hand Church Organ, and an assortment of Parlor Organs.

For further particulars inquire of
HENRY ERBEN, 172 Centre street.

July 17—yl

Just Published, for August.

THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN'S MISCELLANY. A Journal for the Young, containing religious and instructive matter, and illustrated with choice Engravings. Small 8vo., 42 pp. Edited by Rev. J. A. Spencer, A. M., author of "The Christian Instructed in the ways of the Gospel and the Church." Published regularly on the first of every month, at 191 Broadway. Price $1 50 per annum. July 11—yl.

WANTED, a situation as Governess, in a respectable Episcopal family, by a young lady competent to teach the different branches of an English education, as well as the French language, and the Piano Forte. Apply at this office, where satisfactory references will be given. Aug. 7—4t.

From the True Catholic.

THE CENSER OF AARON.

And he stood between the Dead and the Living; and the Plague was stayed.—*Numbers* xvi. 48.

Yes! hold thy censer 'twixt the dead and living,
By fire to show forth Life,—by ashes, Death;
Its vaporous wreaths still upward lightly striving,
Are transient as Man's quickly-fleeting breath;
Yet offered as God saith,
With due rite and firm faith,
His wrath it stayeth or it sweeteneth.

Type thou of power more holy than aught human!
Foreshadowing functions of that Priest Most High
Who in times later came, (true God and true Man,
And so to both in kin and feeling nigh,*)
To stand alone between
Men dead in utter sin
And the avenging, living Deity.

Hence is it from the grace of Christ's anointing
That priestly hands work in such wondrous way;
And that within the Church of His appointing
Mere outward forms exert such latent sway:
They do but Him reflect,
They borrow from His act
The potency all things create obey.

Like Israel in the wilderness of Paran,
The Church counts all her cloud and sea baptize;†
While chosen ones, called, separate like Aaron,
The sinners watch, who their own souls despise,‡
And holy vessels bear
With incense of fond pray'r,
To make atonement as Sin's plague-spots rise.

Yet spite the watch o'er the mixt Congregation—
Beneath His Eye that sees without, within,
(Whose love or wrath claims now no race or nation,)
Pride will break forth and judgment follow sin;§
And, though no visible scourge
The Church's ranks may purge,
A death as hopeless doth its victims win.

Wo to those victims! but *their* fate how awful
Whose hearts, like Korah's, scorn an humbler place;
And, deeming aught above their sphere unlawful,
Seek for their noisy gifts a wider space;
These meet no common end,
Who know not how to blend
Their priestly power with its meek, sweetest grace.

For others, too, there waits as deep perdition—
The Dathans who Christ's 'stablished order slight
And warrant to themselves a full commission
In each distempered voice or wandering light:
They see Damascus hold
Th' Apostle keen and bold,'
But not the trembling Saint and dazzled sight.||

But deepest, saddest is the gloom unending
Of those who with Balaam once have worn¶
An unction from on high; till one day bending
To earthly pomp or wealth or lust, they scorn
Their simple, holy cell
(Where Angels fain might dwell)
To join Earth's strife and win a heart forlorn.

* Heb. ii. 17, 18.
† And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. 1 Cor. x. 2.
‡ Num. xvi. 38.
§ St. James i. 15.
|| Acts xxvi. 9. Compare also Acts ix. 6–18.
¶ Num. xxii.

For the Churchman.

TRACTS FOR THE SEASONS.

NO. CXXXIII.

When we review the Christian system in all its parts, and see its admirable tendency to promote the welfare and happiness of mankind, it would seem difficult to believe that it could meet with decided opposition, or be otherwise than gratefully cherished by those for whom it is so richly fraught with blessings. From its very infancy, however, when the arm of violence was exerted against it, through each successive age, to our time, it has had its decided, warm, and bitter enemies. Its peculiar doctrines have ever exposed it to the enmity of that numerous class of imagined philosophers who exalt their reason as paramount to every other source of information. Those of its precepts which they choose to admit, they proclaim as sufficiently inculcated and enforced by the light of nature; while those which suit them not are thrown altogether out of their system, and opposed.

At the commencement of Christianity, the strongest prejudices of both Jews and Gentiles were arrayed against it. The former saw in it the completion of a religious system which it best suited their views should remain in its imperfect state; and the abolition of a round of superstitious observances, growing out of the corruptions of their law, which were an easy cover to hypocrisy, and regarded as a dispensation from the weightier matters of judgment, mercy, and faith. They saw in it, moreover, the accusation, written in broad and unequivocal characters, of their having been guilty of the blood of the Holy One and the Just—the Lord of glory, whom the Father had anointed to be a Prince and a Saviour. They saw in it the disappointment of the hopes which they had formed of a Messiah who would rescue them from bondage to the Romans, and exalt them to the height of temporal prosperity.

The doctrines of Christianity offended the pride, and its precepts impugned many of the favorite principles and practices, of the Gentiles. They saw in it the prostration of the towering claims of their reason. They saw in it the death-blow to the superstitions which they had cherished, the pageantry of idolatrous worship in which they delighted, and the spectacles of cruelty and obscenity wherein they sought amusement. They saw in it the overthrow of the religion of their fathers, to which they inherited a strong attachment; and the disgrace of objects which they had been accustomed to revere as gods. They saw in it rules of moral and religious conduct and character against which their favorite vices rose rebellions. Their pride, therefore, the strong force of vicious propensities and habits, their attachment to the religion of their country, and their fondness for pleasures which must be banished at the introduction of Christian principles, were all arrayed against the religion of Jesus.

The first active instruments in promulging the Gospel, in the face of the difficulties thus to be encountered, were twelve men of humble rank in society, most of them simple illiterate fishermen, and none of them possessing any worldly influence, or any of the ordinary means of quelling opposition; while the reasons that existed for exciting such opposition, in both Jews and Gentiles, did not exist in vain. Heavy were the persecutions with which they afflicted the disciples of Jesus. Themselves radically differing in their systems of religion, they united in opposing the Christian cause; but were thereby means of establishing its truth. Christians suffered all that cruelty could inflict for asserting facts in which they could not be mistaken, and on which was built the truth of their religion. Nor would they shrink from their constancy through the most lingering tortures, and with martyrdom full before them.

Heated enthusiasts may persist in error, even through sufferings, and unto death. But it is in errors of the imagination, in which they may be strongly deluded. None such, however, can be attributed to the apostles in the testimony which they bore to the Gospel. They asserted facts, of the truth of which themselves and others must have had certain knowledge. Take, for instance, the resurrection of Christ, a fact on which they rested the truth of their cause. He was well known to His apostles; they having lived in the closest intimacy with Him for three years. He was known also to many inhabitants of Judea, and the neighboring countries. He was known to have been publicly executed on a cross, and to have been buried. Soon after, His disciples professed to have seen Him alive subsequently to His death; to have conversed and eaten with Him; to have renewed their former intimacy for the space of forty days; and then to have seen Him ascend into heaven. All this they asserted with every mark of the greatest ingenuousness and simplicity; and with a firmness and consistency which forbid the conclusion of their being other than men in their sound and sober senses. They pretend not to merely secret communications with their risen Master, but speak of Him as equally open to the view of large numbers of persons, as before His decease; appealing to several hundred living witnesses. They acknowledge the difficulty they found in bringing themselves to believe the resurrection of their Lord, notwithstanding His many predictions of the event, and state the full and irresistible proof one of their number had, by a minute examination of His person, that He was indeed the very One whose hands and feet had been nailed to the cross, and whose side had been pierced with a spear.

Is it possible that the apostles would have ventured these assertions, had they known them to be false? And if they were false, they must have known them to be so; for no man's imagination, however perverted, could make him believe, contrary to truth, that for forty days together, he was in close intimacy with one whom he had had every opportunity of knowing well. Those to whom they made these unwelcome allegations could have sent to the sepulchre, and by producing the body, convicted them to their face of imposture.

Put, however, the utterly improbable supposition, that while a guard of Roman soldiers were watching the sepulchre, the disciples had the hardihood to steal the body of their Master, and could effect their purpose: Is it probable—is it possible—that knowing their own deceit and wickedness, they could boldly publish to the world that their Lord had risen, and had been seen by many then alive? and could have persevered in asserting this, even in the extremity of torture and unto death? Every dictate of common sense, and every principle of souud reasoning must be sacrificed, before such a supposition can be entertained. Their constancy, perseverance, and boldness, are a positive proof of Christ's resurrection, and therefore of the truth and divinity of His religion.

The apostles maintained their cause by the assertion of other facts also, in which they could not be mistaken, the falsehood of which would have been easily and promptly detected. Such was the miraculous eclipse of the sun, which they alleged to have happened, a short time before, at the crucifixion of their Lord—miraculous undoubtedly, because happening at a position o the heavenly bodies when ordinary solar eclipses cannot take place. They asserted that at the same time a great earthquake was experienced, and that the veil of the temple was rent. They alleged the opening of graves, and the resurrection thence, and appearance to many, of departed saints. These stupendous events they justly assumed to be evidences that their work was of God; and they were open to general observation, and could have been proved false if they were so. But no such proof was attempted.

In maintaining the religion built on these and other evidences, the apostles were undaunted. They let nothing dishearten them, or discourage their exertions. They braved dangers, endured hardships, and suffered torture and death in their most agonizing forms, without retracting one word of their testimony or their doctrine.

Nay more: in support of what they taught, they worked miracles in the name of Jesus; by a word, a touch, or a prayer, healing the sick, and raising the dead. And their miracles were so open, so exposed to scrutiny, so entirely removed from possibility of their being the result of fraud or collusion, that the very publication of them when and where its falsehood would certainly be detected, is itself proof of their reality. It is also an important and triumphant fact, that their miracles, and those of their Master, were not denied by the early opponents of Christianity. They knew too well their truth; and could only attempt to evade the force of their evidence, by calling to their aid a received doctrine of their day, and attributing them to magic, or to demoniacal influences.

But proof rests not here. The persecutions which hunted the apostles to their destruction, did not soon terminate. For three hundred years Christianity was exposed to virulent opposition, which often fell upon it in most appalling measure. Sufferings and death awaited its advocates on every side. They were falsely accused of heinous crimes as a pretext for cruel slaughter. Thousands endured martyrdom rather than deny the faith of Jesus Christ.

Surely, while human systems have sprung up, flourished for a while under favorable auspices, but never could be of long continuance, save where the weight of despotic authority, and the influence of triumphant arms, unite in their support; nothing but the power of the Most High God could have preserved Christianity amidst such difficulties and dangers. It must be of God. The arm of Jehovah has been stretched out in its defence. He has acknowledged it to be His.

The opposers, then, of this holy faith are literally *fighting against God.* Miserable men! Proudly as they may vaunt themselves on the elevation, the force, the all-sufficiency, of their reason, and confidently as they may mount up in pretension over their fellow men, and look down with scorn on the humble faith which gladly submits to the guidance of heavenly wisdom, they are but preparing for a fall of disgrace and discomfiture, when the long-suffering of Jehovah will no longer abide their impotent pretensions, and the look of His displeasure will wither them.

That must be perverted reason and false philosophy, which sets itself in array against the Infinite Source of intelligence, and is built on principles hostile to the truth which God avouches HE will remain true, though every man be a liar. And He, to the clear satisfaction of sound reason and genuine philosophy, has owned as His the religion of the Gospel.

Let the Christian rejoice that his faith is not founded on human invention. It has God for its Author, God for its Support, and God for its Reward.

Let the penitent Christian rejoice that the faith in which he finds his only hope, is of God. His wisdom counselled, and His might effected, that wonderful scheme of redemption through Jesus Christ, whereby pardon, justification, and salvation, are placed within the reach of all who seek them in true penitence and faith, and sufficient grace is provided to enable all to do so. On this stupendous plan, having at its foundation the great atonement made by the Eternal Son, are built those promises of mercy to the penitent and faithful, which are yea and amen forever. They are of God, and the Christian may lean on them with full and unhesitating reliance.

Alike divine, and alike fraught with unqualified certainty, are the promises, growing out of the same scheme of mercy, of the Holy Ghost's directing and aiding grace to all who duly seek it, and faithfully improve it, enabling them to turn to the Lord in newness of life, and serve Him in sincerity and truth. Every Christian who strives in the faith of the Gospel, and in its spirit of humility and devotion, to work out his salvation, will be enabled so to do. He will find the grace of God sufficient for him, and be endued with heavenly strength made perfect in his weakness. He will have secured to him that interest in the merits of Christ's righteousness which will counterbalance his want of merit, and commend him, for Christ's sake, to the acceptance and everlasting favor of his God.

Abundant cause has the afflicted Christian to rejoice that the consolations which he derives from his religion are of God. He is the Support of His faithful people, and their Refuge and Strength in the day of calamity. The precious promises of His Gospel are especially provided for His suffering people. Let them, possessing their souls in patience, repose on Him meekly, submissively, and with unwavering faith. They will find joy even in the midst of grief, be convinced that it is good for them to be in trouble, and be cheered by the sure and certain anticipation of that far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, to which the afflictions of the present time, duly received, will, through God's mercy in Christ, be rendered contributive.

Let the dying Christian rest securely on His religion, as on the arm of God Himself. From Him emanate the bright rays of comfort and joy which gather around his darkening vision; from Him the hope which, piercing beyond the veil, discloses the immediate presence of his God and Saviour, and the glory, honor, and immortality of heaven; and from Him that song of triumph which dissipates all fear, and elevates the soul above all earthly and mortal affection—*O grave, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?*

The impenitent and unfaithful, the worldly-minded, the spiritually indifferent, the irreligious, and the wicked, should tremble when they think of the divine origin of the Gospel. How can they escape, if they neglect so great salvation! How can they escape, if they resist such infinite love!

B. T. O.

DIOCESE OF LONDON.

ANNIVERSARY OF HARROW WEALD COLLEGE.—(*From a Correspondent.*)—Your readers will, I am sure, be glad to hear something of the happy day spent at Harrow Weald, on Thursday, July 1st., being the anniversary of the College in which you have taken so deep an interest. It will be right, however, to begin with the evening before. A few of the friends of the College had arrived earlier in the day to prepare for the day following, and one or two kept dropping in till near midnight. At half-past nine o'clock, all the boys twenty-five in number, including *two* who were not yet regularly admitted, assembled in the Hall with the visitors for Vespers, each boy with his lamp, which he set on the hall table as he came in. Vespers were chanted most sweetly, and the greatest order and most simple devotion was observed throughout. Mr. Monro conducted them himself, and before the prayers made a short and simple address to the boys on the mercies of the year then concluding, observing on the fact that by God's grace nothing serious bodily or spiritual, had befallen any one of their number during the year. After Vespers the boys retired to their respective rooms, and those visitors who were not accomodated within the College went to their several sleeping-places. The night was short, for by seven o'clock in the morning all were to assemble in the College Hall for Matins. The weather was, from the beginning of the day, most propitious; a soft breeze relieving the heat of the sun and the reflection of a clear and almost cloudless sky. Matins were chanted in the usual simple but solemn manner. This done, the boys went about their several occupations. A few more visitors arrived by eight o'clock, at which hour the Holy Communion was administered in the Church. About sixteen or seventeen persons were present. It was most soothing and cheering to those who could remember the tossings to and fro of anxiety, doubt, and hope, with which in the same service and the same day last year, they had sought God's blessing on the launching of the hitherto untried experiment; and could compare their feelings with the calm thankfulness, and undisturbed quiet of mind with which they could anticipate the celebration of the later part of the day.

When this early service was concluded, all went down to the College, and breakfast was served in the Hall, the boys at their own table down the middle of the room, Mr. Monro and the strangers at the high table. After breakfast the Hall was cleared, and preparations made both there and in the school-yard for the feast in the afternoon. Several of the boys had prepared nosegays and wreaths of flowers, with which the Hall and passages were very tastefully ornamented. Many other friends of the College arrived by twelve o'clock which was the time fixed for Morning Prayer and the Holy Communion. A very large number were present. The Clergy, sixty in number met in the girls schoolroom to put on their surplices, and gowns. As soon as all were habited, a procession was formed in the following order.

First, the boys of the College in their surplices, the Clergy who were in gowns, the junior preceding the senior, then the Clergy in surplices *not* of the Diocese of London, the Clergy of the Diocese, Mr. Monro, Archdeacon Thorp, and, last of all, the Bishop of Cape Town. In this order the procession moved into the Church, chanting Ps. xxxiv.; and while the several persons were taking their places, Ps. xv. was chanted. The best arrangements were made for the seating of all persons of which the Church admits; but all present will allow that no building can be well imagined less suited for the purpose of Divine worship than the present Church at Harrow Weald. The form, the arrangement, and the fittings up are unseemly and incommodious as it is well possible to imagine. (I may notice here that the chancel of a new Church is in course of erection, which promises to be as beautiful as the old one is unsightly; and as devotional as the other is irreverent. The nave will be proceeded with as soon as Mr. Monro receives funds sufficient. Nothing but the funds are now wanting; the site has been marked out more than twelve months since.) Morning Prayer was intoned and chanted by the Rev. H. Wilberforce. The Communion service was read by the Bishop of Cape Town and Mr. Monro, the sermon preached by Rev. W. Dodsworth from St. Mark, viii. 4. While the Offertory sentences were in reading, the alms were collected from the whole congregation by the two head boys. After the Prayer for the Church Militant the Non-communicants left the Church, which I ought to have said had been crowded in every part, and a very large number received the Holy Communion: those who had received early in the morning remaining in the Church, but not partaking a second time.

Service was not ended till four o'clock. After all the Laity had left the Church, the Clergy and boys returned to the school-room in the same order in which they came. After the surplices had been taken off, the whole party—Clergy, laity, and ladies,—went down to the College. There a good substantial dinner was provided, of which the Bishop, Clergy, and boys first partook, and afterwards the ladies and others. Meanwhile some hundreds of poor persons partook of similar provisions, at tables ranged around the school-yard. The Bishop was obliged to return hastily to London; but, before leaving the Hall, he spoke a few kind and earnest words, both to the people assembled there and to the boys. He expressed the great interest he took in the College, the pleasure he felt in being present on the occasion, and his earnest hope that, in days to come, it might be useful to himself in furnishing him with fellow-labourers, and his hearty prayer was that, even in days which he should not live to behold, the College might send forth many trained to do the work of the Church in all parts of the world.

During the dinner, the boys were occupied in waiting upon their visitors in the school-yard; and it was by no means the least interesting part of the day's proceedings to watch the boys, twenty-five in number, at once amusing themselves, and assisting their guests—merry, but without coarseness; full of life and fun, but interfering with no one,—and yet with not a person near them to exercise any control over them. To my mind, this was one of the best proofs of the success and efficiency of the training.

At half-past six, all who were left, moved up again to the Church. The Clergy went in procession as before, but with very diminished numbers. Mr. H. Wilberforce preached a very impressive sermon from 1. Pet. iv. 11. At the conclusion of the Service, the few Clergy and ladies who still remained went down again to the College to have tea, and to assist in, and witness, the actual admission of two boys. Tea was served in the Hall in the same way as breakfast and dinner—the boys waiting on the high table, and on one another. As soon as the Hall was cleared so as for the centre to be vacant, the Clergy and boys retired to the library to put on their surplices. A procession was formed from the library to the Hall, consisting of the two head boys, followed by the Clergy, and Mr. Monro bringing up the rear. As they proceeded up the Hall, they chanted Ps. xxxiv. to v. 11 inclusive—to which the rest of the boys, who remained outside, answered with the 1st verse of Ps. xv. The Clergy, &c, then took up the Psalm and finished it. Upon this, those outside chanted Ps. cxix. 33-40, while those within came down to the door of the Hall; then *all* together walked into the Hall (the two new boys last) chanting Ps. clxviii. This done, Mr. Monro received from the two head boys the new surplices, which up to this time, they had carried, and put them on the two new boys, giving them the blessing. All then knelt down; and with two or three prayers, and the singing the 1st verse of Ps. cxxxiii., this most interesting ceremony concluded. The rules having been read over in the hearing of the new boys, Vespers were chanted, and the boys went direct to their bed-rooms to go to bed. I have omitted to mention that, during the admission of the new boys many persons were at the further end of the Hall to witness the ceremony, including several of the parents of the boys.

At the opening of the College, in July, 1846, *sixteen* was the number admitted. There are now *twenty-five*; and very many applications have been made to Mr. Monro, from various parts of the country, to take other boys, But as every room in the College is now occupied, the buildings must be increased before any additional inmates can be received.

It was a most happy day—a day which all who were present seemed thoroughly to enjoy—a day which must do good to the Church of England, by strengthening the hands of her faithful sons, and showing, that she has a life and power which is not of man, neither by man.

The Midsummer Examination was concluded on Friday. On Saturday morning the prizes were given to the successful candidates; after which the Rev. C Marriott made a few observations to the boys, encouraging them in their studies, and directing their attention to one or two important points where more care seemed necessary.

Advertisements.

Churchman Book and Job Office.

W. H. B. SMITH,

(Successor to H. M. Onderdonk,)

BOOK AND FANCY JOB PRINTER,

No. 11 Spruce street, New York.

BOOK PRINTING, AND BINDING,

done with promptness, and in a style unsurpassed by any in the city of New York.

Checks, Drafts, Notes, Receipts, Bill-Heads, &c.

Executed with neatness and dispatch.

☞ W. H. B. S. having replenished his office with new materials, is prepared to do anything in his line which may be wished. Patronage is most respectfully solicited March 20—tf

MRS. OKILL having announced in her School Circular, July 10, 1847, a departure from what has been, for many years, the *School Term* of her establishment,—taking for it the period between Snpt. 1st and June 30th, instead of as formerly, from Sept. 15th to July 31st,—here presents, to the parents and guardians of her pupils, the following reasons for it:

1. The custom among some heads of families of spending, with their children, a part of the summer in the country, which, formerly limited to a few, and confined to a short period, is now almost general, and extends in many cases, through the entire months of July and August, has, with it, introduced corresponding modifications in domestic and business relations of all kinds; and in none have changes, to meet the salutary habit, become more indispensable than in school arrangements; in the well-working of which so much depends upon keeping the classes together, to attain through instruction, and to promote a healthful emulation.

2. The *necessity* for a systematic and uniform course, presenting to the mind of instructor and pupil equally a character of oneness, in which a well defined goal must be reached before completeness can be attained, is in no department of life more urgent than in that of instruction. Without this characteristic, education looses its chief end: *the establishment of orderly habits of mind and body, and the faculty of bending, at pleasure, the powers of each to the will.* How far unbroken attendance upon school duties, until their completion, must tend to fix these habits, and to prevent the formation of their opposites, and particularly to the one most fatal to the comfort of the individual as well as of others—*desultoriness*—need not be insisted on with any well-informed person.

3. The bond of sympathy between instructor and pupil, which, although to some it may seem of minor consideration, is of truly great importance, both to moral and intellectual development, is greatly strengthened by the two remaining together during the entire course. If the pupil knows she may be taken from school at any moment, and the instructor has the same prospect, the one is kept in a state of mind the least teachable, aud most unfavorable to steady application, whilst the other is as naturally rendered anxious, lest the sole reward that can compensate for the wearisome toil of teaching, the consciousness of having been instrumental in fulfilling the hopes of parents, by presenting to them a well trained mind, may unthinkingly be snatched away when nearly earned.

No. 8 Clinton Place, New-York August 5th, 1847.
☞ School will be opened Wednesday, Sept. 1, 1847.
August 14—7t

ORGAN MANUFACTORY.

GEORGE JARDINE

Removed to 548 Pearl street, near to and opposite the City Hospital, Broadway, New York.

HAVING, since the destruction by fire of his former Manufactory, secured a large and valuable stock of the best and old seasoned wood, and built every convenience for erecting organs of the largest class, he will be enabled to sustain his long established reputation, and he respectfully solicits extended patronage.

Church, Parlor, and Church Finger and Barrel Organs constantly for sale. August 21.

NEW ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

WORKS BY REV. DR. JAMES.

1. A Comment upon the Collects appointed to be used in the Church of England, before the Epistle and Gospel, on Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year. 1th edition. $1 75.
2. Proper Lessons to be read at Morning and Evenihg Prayer, and on the Sundays and other Holy Days throughout the Year, with a short Practical Commentary and Notes. 12mo. $3 50.
3. Christian Watchfulness, in the Prospect of Sickness, Mourning, and Death. 6th edition. 12mo. $1 75.
4. A Comment on the Church Catechism and Occasional Offices; or, The Mother's Help. 12mo. $2 50.

Imported and for sale by
D. APPLETON & CO., 200 Broadway.
August 21—1t

EDUCATION.

A YOUNG MAN, who has for some time taught a select school, is desirous of obtaining a situation as tutor in a private family. In addition to the ordinary English branches, he will, if desired, give instructions in the Latin, Greek, and French languages.

Ample references will be given if wished.

Please communicate with the Rev. Benjamin Evans, Rector of the Church of the Holy Evangelists, New Yor city. August 7—4t

WANTED, a situation as Governess, in a respectable Episcopal family, by a young lady competent to teach the different branches of an English education, as well as the French language, and the Piano Forte. Apply at this office, where satisfactory references will be given. Aug. 7—4t.

CHURCH TRIMMINGS.

THE subscribers keep constantly on hand an assortment of Pulpit Trimmings, consisting of Satin and Worsted Damasks, Silk Velvets, and Plusors, with an assortment of Silk Tassells, Fringes, Gimps, and every other article required for Pulpit Trimmings.

Also furnished to order Pew Cushions, either in Hair or Moss. Pews stuffed and lined.

CHARLES McAULEY & CO.,
Upholsterers, 116 Hudson street.
February 27—yly

TO CHURCHES.

THE undersigned having had many years' experience in the Upholstery business, are prepared to execute all orders for the furnishing of Churches with cushions, desk and pulpit trimming, curtains, aisle and chancel carpets, &c., at short notice, and on reasonable terms. Having a large and superior stock of goods always on hand, there will be no delay in fulfilling orders.

may 16—y G. P. & J. GRATACAP, 31 Maiden Lane.

ISKIFFS PATENT METALIC SARCOPHAGUS,

OR AIR TIGHT COFFIN.

THE attention of the public is invited to this important discovery and improvement, in which the Patentee has succeeded in producing, by a combination of metals, an indestructable material, applicable to the formation of Coffins, Boxes, &c., for the preservation of animal or other perishable substances.

Cast and wrought iron having proved incapable of being made air tight for any length of time, and liable to rapid oxidation, the experiment of galvanizing with zinc was resorted to and for some time excited considerable attention in Europe, but like every other attempt of the kind resulted in a failure; it is now considered of little value for that purpose, and is entirely useless in our climate of extreme heat and cold. It is confidently believed, that this is the only material possessing strength to resist the atmospheric pressure when exhausted, and durability to give it any advantage over the ordinary Wooden Coffin.

The materials of which the Coffins are composed being impervious to air, the body should be immediately deposited and heremetically enclosed; the air can then be exhausted and the subject preserved for an unlimited time with perfect security against contagion, even from smallpox or any other malignant disease. The necessity for immediate interment is entirely obviated, as it can remain without the possibility of any unpleasant effluvia being emitted, affording an opportunity for absent relatives and friends of participating in the performance of the last solemn duties to the deceased.

It also admits of its being transported from any one part of the Country or Globe to any other, either by sea or land, and when deposited in its final resting place, it can at any time be readily recognized, and not liable in the breaking up of Cemetries or removal of the dead to be scattered abroad. When placed in a vault it can at all times be visited without any unpleasantness but such as may arise from sympathy; thus accomplishing with little or no increased expense what for past ages has been attempted in vain. By economy in finishing, the price of the Sarcophagus will be so reasonable as to place it within the reach of all classes who are desirous of preserving the remains of their friends from rapid decay, and from being mingled with that of others. Boxes for the preservation of fruits, water tanks, pipes, and indeed every other description of work to which iron is applied in exposed situations, can be made of this composition at a very trifling additional expense to that in ordinary use. Samples will be ready and may be seen on Monday next at No. 20 Canal street, near Broadway, and at Damerest & Munn's, No. 2 Wall street, corner of Broadway.

August 21. 6t. EDWARD DOYLE, Agent.

RYDAL MOUNT SEMINARY FOR BOYS,

CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

FEW of the delightful mansions for which the vicinity of Boston is distinguished, are possessed of more attractions than the one which has been secured for this Institution. It is distant but ten minutes' walk from the central part of the City of Boston, whilst the extensive grounds around it, abounding in fruit and shade trees, impart to it the united charms of elegance and seclusion.

The course of instruction will include every branch which pertains to an accomplished education. Special attention will be given to the formation of manners, which are the result of habits rather than precepts. The pupils, with their Teachers, are regular attendants at St. John's Church, (Episcopal.)

The health of the pupils is most carefully attended to—the regular exercise—the abundant and wholesome food—and the salubrious situation of the School, are the main causes which conduce to this end, and are found so effectual that the advice of a physician is scarcely ever required. The INSTITUTION is abundantly furnished with all "appliances and means" which may conduce to the amusement and recreation of the boys, out of school hours Gymnastics, Gardening, &c. &c., form a portion of their more atheletic occupations; while for stormy weather, and in-door amusements, every facility is offered for making the time pass in such a manner as to keep the powers of the body and mind in constant and healthy exercise. The whole establishment is made to resemble, as nearly as possible, a large, well regulated family.

Pupils are received at any age over eight years. It is preferred to have them sent at as early an age as convenient, in order that they may receive the full benefit of the course of instruction and moral training pursued in this establishment.

Boarding and tuition in the English branches and the Classics, per year, $200.

A long list of References, of the highest respectability, in Boston and the vicinity, may be seen by any who are disposed to patronize the School.

Circulars may be seen at the office of The Churchman.

T. B. CLOUGH, *Principal.*
E. W. ABBOTT, *Superintendant.*
Rev. WM. WITHINGTON, *Teacher of the Classics.*
F. B. CASAS, *Teacher of Spanish.*
A. AURAY, *Teacher of French and Drawing.*
Mrs. LOUISA PATTERSON, *Matron.*
June 26—3m

THEOLOGY.—LIST NO. 3

Zimmerman on the Knowledge of Christ. 1 50.
Wogan Essays on the Proper Lessons. 4. vols., also in 2 vols.
Pyle's Sermons on Practical Subjects. 2 vols. 2 50.
Neander's General History. 2 vols.
Nelsons on the Holy Communion. 18mo.
Kennaway's Sermons to the Young. 1 50.
Hammond on the New Testament. 4 vols. 8 00.
do do. Folio.
Hare's, Bishop, Whole Works. 2 vols.
Hare's Perservative Against the Errors of Socinianism. 2 00.
Waldo's Commentary on the Liturgy. 1 75.
Toplady's Whole Works. 6 vols. 10 50.
Riddock's Sermons. 2 vols. 3 00.
Hoadley's Whole Works. 3 vols. folio. 10 50.
Burnett's History of his own Times. 2 vols folio. 6 50.

For sale by
STANFORD & SWORDS, 139 Broadway.
A new Catalogue of Theological Stock to be had gratis.
August 21

BOARDING SCHOOL, SHREWSBURY, N. J.

REV. H. FINCH, Principal.

THE location of this School—in the vicinity of Long-Branch—is one of the most pleasant and healthy in the country—with an easy and daily communication with the city. The Summer term will commence on the 1st of May. For particulars, apply at this office; the bookstore of Messrs. Stanford & Swords, No. 139 Broadway, and at the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union, No. 10 John street. March 6—tf

CUTTER'S ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY.

THIS WORK of 342 pages, by Calvin Cutter, M.D., has passed through seven editions of three thousand each in less than two years. It is used in most of the academies and select schools of New England and New York. It embraces—1st, Anatomy—a description of the Human System, illustrated by more than 200 engravings. 2d, Physiology—a description of the use of the several parts. 3d, Hygiene—rules for the preservation of health. 4th, Directions for the proper treatment of accidents—as the recovery of persons apparently drowned, arresting hemorrhage from divided blood vessels, &c.; making it a valuable work for families as well as schools. For sale by

CLARK & AUSTIN, 205 Broadway,
July 31—4t and the Booksellers generally.

CHURCH CUSHIONS, PULPIT FURNITURE, &c.

THE subscribers would respectfullly inform Building Committees and members of churches that they are prepared to execute orders for Cushions, Lining and Stuffing of Pews, Benches, and making Furniture for, and Trimmings of, Pulpits and Desks, of every kind of material used for the purpose, of different styles, at moderate prices, and at the shortest notice.

W. & G. CURTIS, Upholsterers in general,
aug. 3—y 449 Broadway.

BOOKBINDING.

THE Subscriber respectfully informs the public that he continues to carry on the above business in all its branches. All orders punctually attended to.

Reference is made to the following gentlemen—Messrs Stanford & Swords, at whose store orders may be left Rev. Drs. Seabury, Anthon, Taylor, Higbee, and Smith J. M. Wainwright, W. A. Muhlenberg, John S. Rogers, Esq., 194 Fulton.

September 5—yly WILLIAM ASHKETTLE.

CHURCH SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES,

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.

Miss AYRES, Principal.

No. 54 West Twentieth street, New York.

THE Fall Term of this Institution will commence on the 15th of September. A Prospectus of the School may be obtained of the Rev. W. A. Muhlenberg, D. D., No. 110 Twentieth street; of Messrs. Stanford & Swords, No. 139 Broadway; and at the Depository of the Sunday School Union, No. 20 John street.

REFERENCES.

L. M. Hoffman, Esq., J. H. Swift, Esq., W. F. Cary, Esq., Govr. M. Wilkins, Esq., W. H. Aspinwall, Esq., R. B. Minturn, Esq., Murray Hoffman, Esq, Hamilton Wilkes, Esq. July 17—tf

MR. YOUNG'S ENGLISH AND CLASSICAL INSTITUTE,

No. 1 Abingdon Square, corner of Bank st.

THIS School which has for nearly three years been located at No. 88 Fourth street, will be removed on the first of May, to the large and pleasant house, No. 1 Abingdon Square. The rooms will be fitted up and furnished with all the comforts of private parlors.

In addition to a thorough course of English and Classical instruction, the principal modern languages, drawing, vocal music, &c., are taught by competent instructors.

Terms—from $10 to $15 per quarter, without extra charges for any studies. Two or three pupils will be admitted into the Principal's family as boarding scholars, at a charge of $200 per annum, payable quarterly in advance.

Circulars containing particulars, references, &c., may be had till 1st of May at 88 Fourth street.

March 27—tf

TRINITY SCHOOL will re-open on Wednesday, September 10th, 1847.
August 21—2t

☞ *At reduced prices for Cash only* ☜

Published and for sale by

THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, Depository No. 20 John street, New York:

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION

Union Primer,	per hundred,	$2 00
Prot. Epis. Sunday School Book, No. 1,	"	1 25
" " " No. 2,	"	1 50
" " " No. 3,	"	1 75
" " " No. 4,	"	3 50
Questions on the Sunday School Books,	"	4 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,)	"	1 25
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 00
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	6 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,	"	4 00
Beaven's Help to Catechizing,	"	6 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	2 50
Church Catechism,	"	1 00
First Truths,	"	2 00
Duty to God,	"	50
Church Primer,	"	1 25
Sunday School Liturgy, and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	6 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	"	1 50
Harmony of the Creeds,	"	2 00
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 00
Collects from the Prayer Book,	"	1 50
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	6 00
Catechism on the Collects,	"	20 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	6 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, Parts 1 and 2, stiff covers	"	8 00
Manual of Oral Instruction upon the Bible,	"	2 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child, with answers in the words of Scripture,	"	2 00
The History of our Blessed Lord, in Easy Verse,	"	6 00
Bible Companion, vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	18 00
" " vol. 2, New "	"	20 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff cov.,	"	6 00
" " 2, "	"	6 00
" " 3, "	"	6 00
Questions on the Acts, 1, "	"	6 00
" " 2, "	"	6 00
" " 3, "	"	5 00

NEW BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM SIMPLIFIED, *by Questions and Answers*, $3 00.

SCRIPTURE READING LESSONS *for Young children*, $6

☞ A discount of 10 per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools, auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

CHEAP LIBRARY. *One Hundred Volumes* bound, with muslin backs, and containing 158 books, put up by direction of the Executive Committee, for TEN DOLLARS This is believed to be the cheapest Library in th country.

THE LIBRARY to this date, in 167 vols., of various prices. Total, $24,44 nett.

THE CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, bound in 36 vols., of 144 pages each. Price for the set, $6,48 nett.

THE JUVENILE LIBRARY, 6 vols., 32 mo. Price for the set, 87 cents nett.

BEAUTIFUL BOOKS FOR GIFTS.

In quarto form, upon superfine paper.

THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS. An Allegory By the Rev. Wm. Adams. With elegant illustrations. Muslin, gilt, 62 1-2 cents; fancy paper covers, 25 cents.

THE DISTANT HILLS. An Allegory. By the same author. Similarly illustrated. Muslin, gilt, 62 1-2 cts.

SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross, and The Distant Hills, in 1 vol. Muslin, gilt, $1.

THE DARK RIVER. An Allegory. By the Rev. Edward Munro. With 4 elegant illustrations. Muslin, 62 1-2 cents.

THE HISTORY OF OUR BLESSED LORD. In Easy Verse. With beautiful lithographic illustrations, &c. Muslin 50 cents; fancy paper covers, 31 cents.

THE CASTLE ON THE ROCK. With a fine wood engraving. Muslin, 25 cents; fancy paper covers, 12 1-2 cents.

FIDELIS, THE SOLDIER OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE. An Allegory. With a fine engraving. Fancy paper, 8 cents.

NEW LIBRARY BOOKS.

LUKE SHARP. A Tale of Modern Education,	half morocco,	34 cents
THE DARK RIVER,	" " " "	30 "
THE FALL OF CRŒSUS	" " " "	31 "
THE CRIPPLE OF THE RAILROAD,	"	15 "
THOMAS KENMIR.	" " " "	12 "
GOTTFRIED, or THE ISLAND HERMITAGE,		23 "
THE CASTLE OF FALKENBOURG,	"	15 "
HISTORY OF CHARLES JONES,	" "	10 "
PRASCA LOUPOULOFF, or Filial Piety Exemplified,		18 "
BAD HABITS,		10 "

PERIODICAL.

The CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, *monthly publication*, 24 pages, 18mo—single, 25 cents per annum, and fifty copies for $10—payable always in advance.

☞ Address all orders for books, and all remittances to
DANIEL DANA, Jr., Agent,
may 16 Church Depository, 20 John street.

THE MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK.

No. 56 Wall street.

Nett amount of accumulated premiums invested in mortgages and N. Y. State and City Stocks and U. S. Government, $376,282,20.

THIS Company is organized on the purely mutual principle, and its business is restricted by the charter to the insurance of lives, and granting annuities and endowments, and now ranks among the strongest and safest nstitutions in this country. The whole of the profits nure to the benefit of the policy holders. An extensive and prosperous business promises large dividends on the first division of profits on the 1st February, 1848, and persons now insuring will share in these profits if they survive that period.

The premiums are paid annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, if desired, and are as low as any American Company, and lower than the English, with a participation in the profits. Policy holders are secured by investments in bond and mortgages on real estate in the city of New York and Brooklyn, worth double the amount loaned thereon, and in stocks of the State and city of New York, and of the United States.

The transactions of this Company are on the cash principle; consequently the survivors of parties insuring with it will not be subjected to the heavy drawback of accumulated premium notes, reducing the benefit of the assurance to a small pittance.

Persons may effect insurance on their own lives and the lives of others. A married woman can insure the life of her husband, which will inure to her sole use and that of her children.

Pamphlets explanatory of the principles of Mutual Life Insurance, and illustrating its advantages, with forms of application, may be obtained at the office of the Company, 56 Wall street, or of any of its agents.

TRUSTEES.

Morris Robinson,	Alfred Pell,
William J. Hyslop,	David C. Colden,
R. H. McCurdy,	John C. Thatcher,
Frederick S. Winston,	Rufus L. Lord,
C. W. Faber,	William Betts,
Mortimer Livingston,	Joseph Blunt,
Theodore Sedgwick,	Isaac G. Pearson,
Stacy B. Collins.	William Barnewall,
John H. Swift,	William Moore,
Jos. B. Collins,	Zebedee Cook,
James S. Wadsworth	Jonathan Miller,
Henry W. Hubbell,	Fitz Green Halleck,
Gouverneur M. Wilkins,	Robert Schuyler,
John V. L. Pruyn,	Amos S. Perry,
Frederick Whittlesey,	Joseph Tuckerman,
Charles Ely,	Gidnon Hawley,
John C. Cruger,	Wm. J. Bunker,
Walter Joy,	One vacancy.

MORRIS ROBINSON, President.
SAMUEL HANNAY, Secretary.
MINTURN POST, M.D., Physician to the Com'y.
JOS. BLUNT, Solicitor. 504 Broadway
May 22—tf

BOARDING and Day School for Young Ladies, at West Farms, Westchester county, New York.

The Spring Term will commence on the 12th of April, at which time Mrs. Wilkins will again be ready to receive a limited number of pupils as boarders. Those parents who may favor her with the care of their children may be assured that every attention will be paid to their happiness as well as to their education. The village of West Farms is healthy, and at the convenient distance of eleven miles from New York, from which place it is rendered easy of access by the Harlem Rail-road and stages from Morrisania.

For particulars apply personally, or by letter, addressed to Mr. Isaac Wilkins, West Farms.

Circulars may be obtained at the Churchman office, 12 John street. Feb. 27—tf

THE CHURCHMAN

DEVOTED TO THE UNITED INTERESTS OF THE GOSPEL AND THE CHURCH.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

AT NO. 12 JOHN STREET, UP STAIRS,

REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D., EDITOR

"The Executive Committee" consists of the following persons:—Floyd Smith, Chairman; John H. Swift, John C. Thatcher, David Hubbell Hoyt, and Benjamin A. Mumford. Until otherwise announced all communications on BUSINESS AFFAIRS may be addressed to the Chairman, No. 12 John street.